informality of the counselors' approach was at times objected to by the teachers and supervisors, but the counselors were convinced that informal contacts were the best way of building rapport with these students.

The more traditional contacts were in the form of group counseling and guidance sessions and individual tests interpretation and counseling. Guidance consisted of giving the participants information related to occupations, educational opportunities, how to apply for a job, etc. Counseling was defined as those situations where the student could discuss anything he wished.

Group guidance and counseling sessions were held weekly. In the guidance session the counselors made a prepared presentation on some aspect of personal or career adjustment. Audiovisual aids, typically films, were customarily used. The counseling sessions were largely nondirective. The counselor attempted to maintain a continuity in the discussion. Personal problems and various psychological processes of adolescents and adults as well as political problems were often discussed.

In the first half of the year individual counseling and guidance sessions were not scheduled. A student initiated a session only if he desired it. Some students were referred to the counselors for poor attendance, negative attitude, poor class work, etc. In the second half of the year, individual sessions were scheduled to interpret the tests the students had taken and to discuss their future plans. These sessions were also held with the control group subjects.

Spokesmen for the Viewpoint of the Student

The fourth function of the counselors was not always appreciated by other members of the staff. This function was to act as spokesmen for the point of view of the students. Carrying out this function occasionally brought the counselors into conflict with the teachers and supervisors. When a student violated one of the rules of the school, the counselors tended to take the side of the student, even if they personally agreed with the teachers or administrator. They did this to provide another perspective on the issue in question to the other staff members. Most of the other staff members, however, were not familiar with this aspect of counseling and interpreted the counselors' actions as "coddling" or "finding excuses" for the student.

The counselors' advocacy of the viewpoint of the students together with their informal contacts with them led to some antagonism between the counselors and teachers. The teachers, perhaps with some justification, thought that they could chat with the students and lead group counseling sessions just as effectively as the counselors. Because the counselors consistently took the students' position, some of the teachers interpreted this to mean the counselors were "against" them.

The antagonism between the counselors and other staff members was never effectively counteracted. The teachers regarded the counselors as loafing. The counselors saw their major contribution as providing a tone of caring about the students.

More contact between the teachers and counselors should have been provided to remove some of this friction. Due to the nature of the programs, when teachers were not teaching, they were rarely in the building. There was limited opportunity for the teachers and counselors to get together informally. There was also little chance for the teachers to meet with the counselors to discuss special problems they were having with students. More time for both of these kinds of meetings should probably have been provided.

The counselors should have probably taken more initiative in explaining their function to the teachers and in offering to discuss problems with them. Because of the nature of the schools from which the teachers came, they were not acquainted with what an effective counselor actually does. These teachers saw counseling as something set apart from the "real business" of the school. The counselors played an integral role in the programs but in some ways failed to communicate the purpose of this role to the other staff members.

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY

While the University staff was responsible for the overall organization and direction of the project, the final control over the actual content and operation of the skill training and diploma programs was held by the participating school districts. The University staff was, however, able, with differing degrees of success, to influence the operations of the programs.

The influence of the University staff was most pronounced in the diploma program. As was noted in the section on administration, the supervisor of the diploma program was sympathetic with the goals of the project. He willingly entered into discussion with University personnel and consultants. Out of these discussions the underlying supportive approach of the project was developed and ways of implementing this approach were planned.

It is unlikely that this approach would have been followed if the University personnel had turned over all responsibility for the conduct of the program to the school district. Nor is it likely that there would have been as great a stress on non-traditional methods of teaching. There was reduced reliance on textbooks, recitations, and tests. There was greater emphasis on the active involvement of the students, on finding matters of interest to their personal lives. There were attempts to coordinate the separate courses. In one quarter, for example, the teachers of literature, English, and speech worked with a consultant, provided by the University, to coordinate their offerings. In another quarter, reading was taught as part of the study of problems of democracy. The content of problems of democracy was organized into domestic problems, international problems, and the nature of society. Each of these areas was taught by a separate teacher who coordinated his content with that being taught by the other two teachers.

The University helped to obtain permission for some of these innovations from the superintendent of the participating local school district and from the state office of public instruction.

These innovations were not revolutionary but they were definitely an improvement over the approaches used in most of the regular schools in the area where the study was conducted. They were not, however, the best that could have been devised. The purpose of the study was not to design a model school. The main purpose was to test the labor market importance of a high school diploma. To make this evaluation it was necessary that the school not push the students out of school, but it was not expected that this school would overcome all their academic and personal difficulties.

All in all, though, the personnel associated with the project considered the diploma program to be a relative success.

Other data tended to confirm this impression. The University staff was unable to develop a similar approach in the skill training program. As was described in the previous section, the administrator of this program blocked most of the University's attempts. The University was able, however, to prevent arbitrary expulsion of the students. It also provided two guidance counselors who were committed to the goals of the project, and were, to some degree, able to counteract the negativism of the administration. In addition, the University gave the skill training students the opportunity to prepare for and take the general equivalency examination for a high school diploma.

The inability to establish a supportive environment in the skill training program represented one of the major limitations of the project. It seems likely that if such an atmosphere had been established, the skill training program would have been the more successful, in terms of attendance and student reactions. The contents of the courses were directly related to the future goals of the students. The emphasis was on manipulative rather than verbal skill, and the instruction emphasized practical applications. All of these features should have added to the appeal of these courses. Unfortunately, most of the teachers lacked the ingenuity to capitalize on the special features of their courses, and the University was prevented from providing consultants who could have helped them do so.

SUMMARY

The attitudinal tone of the diploma and skill training program appears to have been the major determinant of their relative success and failure. The tone of the diploma program was supportive and accepting. The tone of the skill training program was not.

The tone of the separate programs was greatly influenced by the attitudes of their administrators. The administrator of the skill training program was basically against the program. This attitude was communicated to the supervisor, counselors, and teachers. He provided a minimal program which lacked even adequate equipment and supplies, not to mention curriculum assistance for the teachers. The administrator of the diploma program was just the opposite. He identified personally with the success of his program and put his full energy into running it the best way he could.

The counselors in both programs helped to establish the attitudinal mood. They were concerned about the students and, through both formal and informal contacts, did their best to show this concern. They acted as spokesmen for the students in discussions with other members of the staff and provided customary counseling and guidance services.

The contribution of the University personnel to the attitudinal mood of the program was innovative. The University personnel led the diploma program to try different ways of reaching the students. In the skill training program, however, the University personnel were not able to lead the teachers to appreciate the problems which the students were confronting or to influence them to make special efforts to help these students.

CHAPTER VII

CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL TEACHERS

Introduction

The results of this study indicate that the general atmosphere as reflected in the attitudes of administration and teachers and in their approaches to the student is the most crucial determinant of the success of any program geared to the training of high school dropouts, or for that matter, of any group of people who have faced problems and failures in our society, and who may represent future dropouts.

The purpose of this chapter is to contrast the successful and the unsuccessful teachers in the program. A composite picture of the effective teacher and the less effective teacher was developed from taped interviews with the instructors in the program. Teachers were evaluated as either successful or unsuccessful on the basis of ratings of 25 categories concerning teacher attitudes, behavior, and effectiveness. For an explanation of these ratings see Appendix C. The unsuccessful category included teachers who fell into an "average" bracket because it appeared that the general effect of instructors who were only "average" was detrimental to a program which required a highly specialized approach to the type of student enrolled in the experimental program. As a result of the ratings eight teachers were categorized as successful and 14 were classed as unsuccessful, including eight ineffective and six average teachers.

In the following sections the characteristics of both the successful and the unsuccessful teachers are isolated and examined in an attempt at clarification and explication although it is obvious that these characteristics are basically inseparable, as they interact with each other. There appeared to be three crucial aspects of the teacher's relationship with his students: (1) his ability to relate to them personally, (2) his ability to teach them, and (3) his attitude towards them.

(1) The major correlates of ability to relate to the student-oriented approach to teaching, insightfulness, personal flexibility, tendencies to critical self evaluation, and willingness to assume the role of a "listener" and even of counselor when necessary.

(2) The instructor's success as a teacher depends upon his flexibility and creativity in approaching the teaching situation, his personal dynamism, and his willingness to expend effort and energy beyond the minimum required.

(3) The attitudes which the teacher brings to the classroom are fostered and reinforced by his personal characteristics and his interaction with the students. His success in approaching the youth as a teacher and as a person is contingent upon the projection of a positive, accepting, and caring attitude. Any negative emotions on his part are inevitably communicated to the students in subtle but lethal forms. The examination of attitude will focus on the regard the teacher has for his students personally, socially, and academically.

As indicated, "reaching," teaching, and attitude are so closely interrelated that their separation is in a sense artificial and unrealistic. A teacher with a negative attitude cannot relate to his students and a teacher who cannot relate to his students, especially youths with personal problems and learning difficulties, cannot effectively teach them. For the present analysis, however, it is essential to attempt to isolate certain of these characteristics in order to understand them fully. Consequently, on the following pages, these qualities are examined in detail, granting that these constellations of variables constantly interact and influence each other and thus in actuality are inseparable.

In describing successful and unsuccessful teachers it is relatively easy to discuss in detail the characteristics of successful ones. Many excellent instructors manifest a majority of the personality traits discussed. However, the unsuccessful teacher is far more difficult to pin down, especially on the basis of taped interviews with the teachers themselves who naturally attempt to present themselves in the most favorable light possible. Consequently, drawing out the ineffective teachers and their characteristics was far more difficult. But, the evidence must come from the teachers themselves. Their lack of insight, flexibility, and concern was most apparent in the comparison between their interactions with the students and with the successful teachers. The juxtaposition was indeed striking. Many teachers openly discussed superficial rapport with the students, inability to communicate, and outdated, non-stimulating teaching techniques simply because they lacked the insight and the awareness that these measures were faulty and that they had failed with the students. Others, in attempting to say what they believed the interviewer wanted to hear, made rigid, ignorant statements which indicated far more aptly the stagnant, prejudiced nature of their approach to life and to the students. Some of the negative attitudes drawn from the tapes are based on sketchy comments, or "slips" and thus are subject to inference, rather than solid documentation. No instructor sitting before a microphone is going to say that he dislikes Negroes, or that he considers lower-class individuals less worthy. Enough can be inferred, however, from occasional slips, and the general tone of the interviews, to substantiate the evidence in the section devoted to teacher attitudes.

No one teacher manifested all of the negative characteristics which will be discussed on the following pages, just as no one teacher possessed all of the good qualities. Many of the teachers classified as unsuccessful have one or more detrimental traits and a complex of varying degrees of other traits. Thus, the following picture of an unsuccessful teacher is a composite one drawn from the negative characteristics of all of the less successful teachers. It represents no one individual.

RELATING TO THE STUDENTS

In isolating the teacher's ability to relate to the students the focus is upon his success in developing a rapport with the students, talking with them, laughing with them, counseling them, reaching them on their own level. The art of reaching people, of eliciting an effective response from them, is perhaps synonymous with the ability to communicate an effective response to others--to communicate concern, interest, and affection. This requires an authentic response of one human being to other human beings. There can be nothing condescending or superficial in the communication. It must be genuine and unqualified. To prevent these students from dropping out again the teacher must be able to project his acceptance, concern, affection, and support

This same teacher also found that this sense of inadequacy predominated other aspects of the youths' lives, sometimes even interfering with learning. One of his younger and smaller students related to him and identified with him as a "big brother" and would do constructive and careful work for the instructor when he was alone in the room. When the other students were present, however, his sense of inadequacy in terms of the high valuation of manliness and the "sissy" nature of school stressed by his peer group, caused him to do little work, because he wanted to prove that he was strong. The instructor was aware of this and tried to handle the problem with understanding.

This sense of inadequacy generates a great deal of frustration and anxiety in the scholastic situation. As one of the instructors who concentrated on reading problems points out, quitting may have been a better alternative than staying in high school for many of these dropouts. By leaving school they relieved themselves of the anxiety and frustration resulting from the confrontation of senior high school reading materials.

Other teachers found that the teasing of other students could cause personal blocks which prevented the youths from performing to capacity. If students were paired to work together on a mechanical repair project, for example, the smarter boy would get angry and tell the less able, "You dumbhead, move out!" But, if the "dumbhead" worked by himself, he could work very hard for the teacher. One such youth even succeeded to his delight in tearing down a conventional machine and putting it back together so it would run.

The frustrations of these youth are frequently vented by physical activity, and a perceptive teacher must discriminate between aggressions which are directed towards others in a harmful way and those which are attempts to "let off steam." One teacher understood the frustration and need of a student to prove his manhood by pounding on machines with a hammer, and by talking and acting big. He handled these problems gently but firmly in an effort to teach the boy control.

An understanding of these coping behaviors which the students utilize in handling their emotions is essential to any successful teacher. The reading instructor saw in many of these students the same problems he confronts in his remedial reading classes in the elementary grades with the "culturally different" child. He saw the same defense mechanisms, the mannerisms, the rebellious and hostile facade, the anti-intellectual attitude towards schooling of the subculture, and even the same reading problems. The difference frequently was only a matter of age, for many of these older students were coping with the same problems, attitudes, and reading difficulties which they had faced in the primary grades.

The realization that middle class values are basically foreign to this group is also important for the teacher. One of the Negro teachers who confronts many similar problems in the 95 per cent Negro school in which he regularly teaches pointed out that these students need to sense acceptance, affection, and concern before they can identify with the instructors and begin to incorporate some of the middle-class values and attitudes which are essential to functioning in society. These students have failed before in the society and they need to find acceptance and success in the school before they can begin to aspire realistically to economic and social goals in everyday life. The students in this program were able to identify with their teachers, and to take on some of the responsibility for making the program a success because they realized that the teachers were faced with new situations and new problems just as they were and that they too were sometimes uncertain and groping at straws. Above all, they realized that the faculty was earnestly trying to reach them and to help them.

One of the basic problems in the dropout-teacher relationship is that basically both parties are confronting an individual from an alien subculture. The following comment from the teacher cited above captures aptly the scope of this problem.

> Most dropouts are from low economic backgrounds. Many educators don't live in these areas and lack understanding of these students. Before the teacher can do an effective job he must learn to understand them. They dropped out because they couldn't fit in a middle-class valued school. They don't know what you're talking about. Their standards of morality and their aspirations are totally different. They frankly tell you that they don't understand the teachers and vice versa. This school's (i.e., the experimental program) value system was closer to their need, was more sensitive to their feelings. We got closer to their system of values because we have less rigid requirements. Lack of discipline is a component of their daily living.

> Parents are concerned with functional things--clothes and food are the big problems. 'Future' to parents or children doesn't include college though they may pay lip-service to it. Among their peer groups and parents it is difficult to get food and clothes. They function at the so called 'lower levels.' Democracy doesn't mean anything. Their conept of freedom is 'I can do what I want to do.' Theory, philosophy, academics, don't reach them.

The above comment succinctly states the problem of the teacher confronted with the dropout or potential dropout. Insight into the non-middle-class world of the student is essential. Awareness of the fear and frustration with which they face academic work, and of the tremendous personal sense of inadequacy which haunts many of them, of their frequently immature defense mechanisms, and of their alien value system are vital tools for any teacher who wishes to reach these students.

In contrast to the comments of the sensitive teachers who had many ideas as to why the students in the program had been dropouts, the less successful teachers did not attempt to understand them. A typical interview with a teacher who lacked insight contained many superficial attitudes and answers to questions about the students, their motivations and problems. One teacher when asked what brought the students into the program comments:

> That I cannot understand, because I don't have the background for it. First, I heard they were on public assistance. Second, I heard the state unemployment service encouraged them, and third, some of the boys had girlfriends here and wanted to be with them.

The students naturally reacted negatively to teachers who were insensitive to their problems and who made no attempt to understand them. Such teachers commented on the unenthusiastic response of their classes and the need to do all the talking themselves. The sensitive teachers, who taught these same students, praised their interest and enthusiasm.

Another equally detrimental variety of insensitive teacher is the individual with an approach to life that includes archaic, pat attitudes towards people, their nature, their problems, and how to deal with them as well as rigid and unchangeable approaches to students, to teaching, and to life in general. Such an individual functions this way not only in the classroom, but in all his personal interactions with people. He is incapable of modifying his behavior for he views his environment through a set of filters which provides neat answers for all questions. Such an instructor can have a very detrimental effect upon individuals with such an abundance of personal problems and concerns and with overwhelming learning problems which must be coped with in the classroom. He is incapable of interpreting or adjusting to the reality of the present moment. He automatically analyzes his environment in the same rigid patterns which he has always employed.

It is not difficult to detect this type of thinking and personal interacting from a taped interview with the subject. The following are comments of one such individual. Throughout the interview this instructor attempted to impress the interviewer with his broadminded acceptance of the students and his understanding of their problems. His personal rigidity was such, however, that what resulted was a statement of his failure that showed he lacked the sensitivity and awareness to realize the picture he portrayed of himself. Stereotyped statements, rigid thinking, and dichotomies of "black and white" extremes were typical of his commentary throughout the tape. In the following quote he seems to be attempting to win the approval of the interviewer by commenting that the dropouts are the better students, that the nondropouts are the "bad guys." He comments:

> Nine times out of ten they (dropouts) are not dummies. The real dumb kids will stick it out and not cause any trouble. The teachers will pass them. But the kid with spunk, who asks questions, causes trouble, makes some of the teachers burned up. Some teachers don't want to answer questions, but these are the kids you want to play along with, they're the ones who will amount to something, not the ones who sit in the corner. My best behaved students have turned into murderers, suicides, robbers. They're antagonistic to society, the loner types. But they're not leaving school though they're not worth a hoot outside.

The ludicrous nature of this extreme overstatement can be explained by a desire to please an interviewer whom this teacher perceived as a representative of Penn State-Research-Government, etc. This individual, however, probably expected it to be accepted at face value. This expectation alone indicates the level of his interpersonal sensitivity and insight.

Typically the uninsightful teacher advocated methods of dealing with the students in the classroom and in discipline situations which were completely counter to the goals of the program. He was convinced that the techniques he used with regular high school students, which were probably equally ineffective, were most appropriate to this group of students. Generally, there were two specific methods of dealing with the students suggested by such teachers. A common solution for coping with discipline problems in their regular classes was to use physical punishment, or generally "rough up" the student. In the classroom, condescending pep talks, intended to bolster spirit and encourage performance, were typical of several instructors.

Teachers who advocate the physical intimidation of students generally have excellent rationalizations for doing so. One teacher who advocates giving the student "a good smack" now and then comments:

> Too often they have somebody soft and easy with them. They should be knocked around. You can tell them how important something is but it just doesn't register. But you can see them ten years later and they'll say 'why didn't you beat me up when I wanted to quit?'

The detrimental results of this approach were mentioned by successful teachers, particularly one who admitted that he had driven some students out of his regular high school through the use of physical punishment. Most of the instructors who said they used this type of punishment in their regular classes reported no need to do so with the students in the program. They said there were few occasions to do so, and the students, being older, "might not appreciate it."

Pep talks were also carefully avoided by the successful teachers because of their connotation of discrimination and condescension. Any effort to encourage the students was on a person to person basis. Successful teachers carefully cultivated a sense of worth and potential on the part of the students by treating them as people and as equals, rather than by talking to them as if they were younger or inferior to their instructors. One unsuccessful teacher proudly related his one technique for reaching the students--a weekly half-hour pep talk. Aside from this activity he concentrated narrowly upon the subject matter. He was convinced that he helped to keep some of the students in school by this approach. He repeated, week after week, the same encouragement such as: "I see you are doing a little better each week. Don't give up. I know you'll have to be absent sometimes, but try to keep it up." He would also give them examples that illustrated the necessity for working for what one received in life.

In subtle, sensitive expression, many of these ideas were indeed beneficial to the students. However, these were not naive high school students. They were world-hardened people who had faced considerable hardship in their lives. This superficial attempt at communicating with the students may have salved the conscience of the teacher and made him feel that he had done his share with them. It if doubtful if it could have had any positive effect. At best, it might have been taken with sarcasm by these students, each of whom needed to be accepted as a person in his own right and respected and understood.

These pep talks reflect the unsuccessful teachers' tendency to treat these students as if they were of high school age. Many of the unsuccessful teachers advocated no discrimination between these students and their usual classes. They were unwilling to admit that these people required different treatment. They seemed unaware that these youth had confronted failure again and again in society, that they were older and more world-wise and that they considered themselves misfits. One teacher specifically recommended: "If you want students to buckle down you should treat them like regular high school students."

One of the basic premises of the successful teachers is that these students were not like secondary school pupils, that they must be treated as individuals, as adults, as people who have lived, have experienced, and were aware. One of the major reasons for the success of the diploma program was that it did not resemble the high school situation in which many of these students had been unable to function.

The unsuccessful teachers seemed unaware of the distinction between these students and regular high school students. They were unaware of the non-middle-class world of the student, of the bewilderment the youths faced when confronted with the values, attitudes, and behaviors taken for granted among the middle-class. They did not and could not sense the fears and frustrations which drove many of the students originally from the scholastic situation and which continued to affect them in the new situation, frequently causing defensive, belligerent, or withdrawn behavior on the part of the students. They had no perception of the sense of personal inadequacy which caused the students to hide behind immature defense mechanism and overcompensatory swaggering behavior. The uninsightful teacher functioned only on the superficial level, never seeing the depth of problem and personality in the students, and thus, never coping with it or responding to it.

Student-Oriented Approach

One of the more successful teachers pointed out that the basic quality of a good teacher is that he is student-oriented. He defined a good teacher as one who is "pupil-centered rather than content-centered." Certainly this is an inherent quality of the "relating" teacher, for a content-oriented teacher would never concern himself with developing personal rapport. This simply means that the good teacher concentrates on the students and their problems, needs, and learning difficulties rather than on covering material or meeting academic standards. He tailors the subject matter to fit the needs of the students, aiming to instill the desire to learn and to provide the tools for the acquisition of further knowledge in the non-scholastic situation. Many of the truly successful teachers found that the presentation of subject matter itself was peripheral to the inculcation of a sense of personal worth, faith in ability to succeed, desire to learn, and certain other middle-class values which facilitate acceptance in our society.

The subject-oriented teachers on the other hand, focused their efforts on injecting academic knowledge into the students. High test scores, good recitation, and neat and organized work papers were the type of feedback which they found most satisfying. Many of the unsuccessful teachers could not derive even this satisfaction from their students, for they were unable to inspire or interest the students, or to enthuse them to work for them. The solution of the academically geared teachers when confronted with students with learning or discipline problems was to weed out those who could not meet certain standards of proficiency and behavior. The students who caused disturbances, were slow learners, or had other difficulties were not seen as people needing extra help, but as obstacles who made the teaching of subject matter more difficult. The key to success, which many unsuccessful teachers stressed as one of the main failings of the program, was to supply sufficient workbooks, suggested syllabuses and readymade tests. These instructors, in general, were unable to draw on their own resources and were thus convinced that such teaching materials were of primary importance.

Such teachers were far more concerned with the routine of the educational process--workbooks, recitation, tests, marks, etc.--than they were with helping the student to learn. They believed their job was to present the material. It was the students' job to learn it. They clung to these ideas despite numerous attempts to explain to them the special learning problems which were characteristic of these students. One instructor commented typically:

> This was a learning situation. We weren't there to pamper and coddle them.

Another asserted:

> You can't spoon feed these students. They've got to have the original desire to learn something themselves.

Since many of these students obviously did not have this desire, the subject-oriented teachers thought the solution was to eliminate them from the program. One teacher commented:

> They (his class) didn't have the basis to do this kind of work. The administrators should have given selection of students more thought.

Some instructors never bothered to approach their students individually. They automatically judged and labeled them at first glance and never attempted to re-evaluate the situation. For example,

> I gave up on one boy quickly because I felt he would drop out. I can spot the bad ones the first day. There's something about them that I can tell.

Teachers who perceived students in this way usually act towards them in a manner that causes their expectations to be fulfilled.[1]

---

[1] Since the writing of this chapter, this observation has been verified by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1966) who have demonstrated experimentally the effects of the expectations of teachers upon the academic achievement of their students. For a further discussion see Chapter II of this report.

The student-oriented teachers were aware of the tendency of their students to anticipate failure in their academic efforts. They, therefore, spent considerable time structuring their courses to provide success experiences. When testing the students, for example, they gave them the choice of "easy" or "hard" tests, made sure there were questions that everyone could answer, provided additional questions that could be answered for extra credit, and so on.

Instead of suggesting that the students be selected more carefully or dropped from the programs, the successful teachers felt a personal commitment to help each student to succeed. They considered this program to be a last chance for many of the students, and hence tried to the best of their ability to assist the students to acquire the attitudes and skills that society requires.

All of the successful teachers found that instilling these broader social and personal attitudes was far more important than cramming history, or arithmetic, or biology into the students' heads, or demanding rigid attendance and absolute grading systems. These teachers found themselves more frequently than not outside the realm of pure academics and in the area of life itself.

Critical Self Evaluation and Personal Flexibility

The most striking difference between the successful and unsuccessful teachers was the degree to which they were critical of their own shortcomings. The successful teachers admitted their initial negative reactions to the students. They told of the problems they encountered in attempting to interest and to motivate the students, and of the frequent sense of personal frustration they experienced. When discussing these problems, the successful teachers focused on the teaching process and the ways in which traditional education had failed these students. The unsuccessful teachers, however, were convinced that all of the problems stemmed from the characteristics of the students -- their lack of intelligence, poor academic skills, immaturity, negative attitudes, etc. These teachers rarely referred to any of their own personal deficiencies. Typically they used the same teaching methods they employed with their regular students. The ineffectiveness of these methods was attributed to the low ability of the students.

Most of our successful teachers evaluated themselves critically in the course of the program. In their willingness to look at themselves honestly, to admit their mistakes, and to attribute their inability to reach the reticent or hostile youth to their own inadequacies, they were able to build the foundations for a flexible and creative approach to the students. Several recalled regretfully minor incidents when they reacted quickly and irrationally which they were determined not to repeat. One teacher grabbed a student who was chronically a petty grievance to him and pushed him by the coat collar against the blackboard in a moment of irritation. As he comments "I frightened the boy though I didn't really mean to. Well, maybe I did at first, but I was sorry that I had. Although I will say he did straighten out. He understood the language." Another, finding himself confronted with an irate, belligerent youth who was arguing over trivialities, "unfortunately" lost his temper and angrily labeled the student's comments as stupid and irrelevant in front of the class.

These teachers re-evaluated their own actions and relationships with their students every time that they personally reacted negatively to a situation, and thus they became more sensitive and accepting. Many of the instructors found themselves changing both personally and as teachers under the impact of contact with these students.

Many found grounds for severe criticism of their approach to the students and to their own teaching prior to the experience of participating in this program. One teacher admitted that in the past he had actually contributed to the problems which caused students to leave school. As he comments:

> In the regular high school I'm known as a disciplinarian as such. I'm just a big bad guy and those fellows who fall out of line I have a tendency to straighten out physically or otherwise--lose a tooth or have a discipline session after school. ...These students had always been a problem. I had never been able to reach them in any other way. 'Either you stay after school or I'll bend you over the desk I'll lay the wood to your gluteus until you've seen the light.' In some cases I've found that this only tends to make them even more stubborn, more resistant to change... I felt that I had failed a number of them, that I wasn't able to give them anything and old forms of discipline just were not satisfactory,

> were not reaching them. The kids were just moving further away from the school itself and I may have been a factor in their actually leaving.

This same teacher comments that he had become quite narrow-minded and he is grateful for the personal upheavals which were precipitated by involvement in the experimental program. Now he relates, with satisfaction that his regular high school students tell him that he is "getting soft." Similarly, another teacher comments that though he probably will not lose his "sternness" in dealing with students in mass in the halls and cafeterias and assemblies, that "sternness" has been much softened in the classroom situation because of this experience with the dropout program.

Other staff members relate that they have become more insightful, less rigid, and more concerned with the students, especially the slow ones. As one teacher comments:

> This program has helped the teaching situation in the regular public schools. We were forced to adjust to situations here with which we were not familiar, situations which we were inclined to dismiss in the public school. Before, if you had a situation with a kid you would say 'well, that's it.' Now there is a change in attitude and you would say 'what caused it, and what did I do?' Personally I feel that I'm a better teacher for it.

Many teachers found themselves asking the question

> Are they incapable or are we incapable of reaching them?

Many found the answer rather disconcerting.

> I suddenly became very aware of my inadequacy. Suddenly down here [i.e., the experimental program] I'm aware that I'm teaching individual human beings. I'm frustrated with reading, and other things. There must be some way to reach them. I have become more human. I have been helped as much as anyone by this program.

> I haven't been a successful teacher--I know it--not in a textbook situation. When you talk to these kids they seem to take what you say more seriously. I just feel, maybe, I could have done more.

These are the comments of a teacher who, it was generally agreed, was among the best if not the best teacher in the program.

Several admit that they had gotten into a real rut as teachers in the regular public schools. Many have transferred some of their experimental techniques to the regular school situation. Discussion groups, small impersonal groups, individual instruction of slow students, laboratory work, and other more exciting experiences for the non-college-prep students have all been incorporated into the public school teaching of these dedicated men. All left the program with a strong sense of gain, both as persons and as teachers.

This tone of personal concern, of frankness, of a willingness to evaluate one's reactions and methods was lacking among the unsuccessful teachers. Instead of talking about teaching, they discussed the characteristics of the students. Instead of mentioning their own personal faults, they complained of inadequate texts and workbooks. Instead of describing how the program had affected their regular teaching, they reported that their approach was the same in both settings. Self-criticism rarely occurred during the interviews of the unsuccessful teachers.

Neither was there any mention by the unsuccessful teachers of the need to assume the role of concerned listener which is discussed in the next section. It was only the better teachers who perceived the need of the students to discuss their personal problems and it was only these teachers who had the type of relationships with their students that made such discussion possible. Consequently, the following section does not compare the successful and unsuccessful teachers. Instead it is concerned solely with comments of the successful teachers.

Counseling and Listening

The teacher who related successfully to the student usually found himself falling naturally into the role of sympathetic listener, and frequently of counselor. For these youth were seeking someone to talk to, someone who understood and accepted them. As one teacher who wished to continue this type of work pointed out

> I'm not a social worker, but there's a lot that can be done by just talking to these kids. I'm so doggone close to the kids. I told [the administrator] one time that I couldn't take too much of this because you get too wrapped-up [so] that you couldn't even teach.

Having someone who would listen, who was concerned and interested, was a vital aspect of the program. Many of these students had severe personal, family, and financial problems which, aside from any scholastic difficulties, frequently interfere with their attendance and their concentration. Many never had anyone on whom they could depend for support and guidance and many had also faced rejection because of their problems. As the students developed a rapport with their teachers they naturally turned to them to discuss their problems. Often students would just wander up to talk after class. All the better teachers agreed that the students needed a great deal of personalized attention and they attempted to cater to that need. Many teachers felt that they had more personal contacts with the students than did the guidance counselors themselves.

As one of the teachers points out, the counseling role of the instructors contributed greatly to the success of the entire program:

> I talked to at least half on a personal basis. There wasn't anything planned. It was just kind of a natural thing. I would be there and they would walk up and start talking. This doesn't happen in a regular school. You see, this is what I mean when I say that these kids were very eager; and I think they're eager because they have found some people who will listen to some of their problems and to what they have to say and in these cases we were listening and this meant a big thing to them.

Another instructor sees this need for the counselor-teacher as springing from the emotionally deprived environments from which many come. "These kids have no ear at home. They respond to the listening teacher. Teachers need to feel them out, and their problems."

Often the successful teacher took a counseling approach with students who were disrupting the classes. One teacher confronted a youth who was constantly moaning and groaning, reading the bulletin boards, talking and making other disturbances in class by calling him up at the end of the period and asking, "What the hell's the matter with you?" He found himself facing a shaking, livid youth who raved that he couldn't stomach the course and that he had a very bad temper. In an impromptu counseling session the instructor, unintimidated by his belligerence, successfully impressed upon the student the need for self-control and social conformity in a certain situation which the student applied in the classroom and hopefully generalized to other situations. "At the end of the session the student was much better. We understood each other. He didn't like school any better, but he understood that there should be a bit of control on the part of the individual."

Several other teachers approached students who were chronically late or who fell asleep in class with a concerned and non-critical tact only to discover that these students had serious problems which interferred with their schooling and which made their tenacity in the program truly remarkable. One teacher confronting a boy who was always late by inquiring "How come you're so tired each night?" The boy replied that his father was an alcoholic which made it necessary for the boy to support the entire family by holding a full-time job. He believed, despite his severe personal and financial problems, that a diploma would considerably ameliorate his difficulties. With his immediate problems the teacher at first couldn't "get through" to him. But he found that, by being willing to listen to his student, he quickly became quite willing to divulge information, to talk things over, to make this a thrashing ground for his problems.

Another teacher relates an incident with a student who was self-conscious because he came to school directly from work and always had grease under his nails. He approached the teacher one evening to apologize for falling asleep in class. The teacher, realizing the physical drain and determination of this student, suggested that he go ahead and sleep in class when he was tired. Needless to say, these teachers, with their sympathetic, reasonable concern aided these students in overcoming the obstacles to attending school.

A good teacher need not necessarily assume the role of counselor. One of the most dynamic and successful young teachers reluctantly accepted the role of listener, but always avoided the role of counselor. "I don't believe in getting personally involved with the students so I never pry or talk about it. I prefer to keep a distance." When approached by students who wished to discuss their problems this teacher would simply reply with relevant small talk, communicating to the student that the problem was understood and that the student had the teacher's sympathy, but that the teacher could do nothing about the problem.

In a program such as this it is evident that at least some of the teachers must be willing and able to assume the role of counselor and listener. These students had a strong need to express themselves and draw some of their burdens outside of themselves and present them to others who expressed interest and concern.

Conclusion

Hopefully, the excerpts from the teacher interviews on the preceding pages have portrayed what is meant by relating to the student. The intent was to present a composite picture of the successful teacher as he develops and cultivates a rapport with his pupils and to contrast this with the approach of the unsuccessful teacher. The components of the ability to relate were divided into insightfulness, student-oriented approach, self-evaluation and personal flexibility, and counseling and listening functions. This division while admitted somewhat artificial, was used for clarification. This categorized analysis was intended to facilitate the understanding of those aspects which are inherent in the ability to relate to school dropouts or potential school dropouts.

In general, the successful teachers exhibited all four aspects, while the unsuccessful teachers showed none of them. The successful teachers attempted to understand the characteristics of the students and the reasons for their attitudes and problems. They were concerned with the student and sought ways of helping him to learn and were less concerned with the presentation of material. They were willing to admit their personal faults, negative reactions, and the lack of an ability to reach the students in meaningful ways. They constantly tried to develop more successful ways of making their subject matter more interesting to the students. And, they reported talking to the students on a person to person basis. These types of behavior were never mentioned in the interviews with the unsuccessful teachers who revealed stereotyped attitudes concerning the nature of the students, who were not self-critical, who lacked flexibility in their teaching methods (which were subject-oriented), and who never achieved a relationship in which the students approached them with a personal problem.

TEACHING THE STUDENTS

The topic of relating to the students has been presented before the discussion of the more immediate task of the instructor--teaching subject matter--because the analysis indicates that a teacher who focuses upon subject matter to the detriment of personal interactions cannot be successful. Admittedly the division between "reaching" and "teaching" the student is again somewhat artificial but necessary for the sake of clarity. The successful and unsuccessful teachers in the role of teacher per se will be examined in this section. Successful teaching involves three basic attributes aside from those discussed under the topic of relating to the student. These include: flexibility and creativity, personal dynamism, and willingness to exert effort.

Flexibility and Creativity

Flexibility and creativity are essential to success in teaching youth who have failed because of personal problems and learning difficulties. The rigid, academically-geared American education system tends to ignore and reject the maladjusted youth. Many of these dropouts associate the school with failure and rejection. Others who have grown up in an environment which places little value on education find the school dull, boring, and useless. To retain these students, teachers must develop fresh, exciting approaches to teaching techniques, including the selection and presentation of subject matter as well as flexibility and ingenuity in grading systems and testing.

Many of the conventions and regulations which bind secondary education in this society simply cannot be applied to a program for dropouts or potential dropouts. They require an unconventional, flexible approach. As one teacher points out,

> They need to be in a 'non-high school' situation. These kids are older, more aware of the bad things in life. Half the high school kids are still completely optimistic. These kids have been knocked

> around. They could never put up with the stupid rigamarole of public education.

Many teachers in attempting to maximize individual contact and attention for each student found themselves using a great deal of discussion and informal grouping. They tended to avoid straight rows of chairs and constant lecturing. They concentrated more on discussion, directed thinking, and the exchange of ideas because these students had a strong need to be heard and to have their opinions accepted.

One of the first discoveries of the teachers was that it was essential that they reconstruct their course format in order to present the students with materials of high personal relevance. Many found that academic abstractions were lost on these students, yet they took great interest in topics which they could identify with themselves or with those around them, even when the topics were very difficult and involved new concepts and ideas.

These students placed no value on abstract concepts, but they became excited and involved in subjects that they could apply to themselves and to their lives. One of the teachers who has a keen sense of the effects of home environment upon these youths commented that he had great success with topics which were close to them, such as the boy next door who was in Vietnam. Problems to them included such immediate considerations as the price of milk. Since most of their kin were among the ranks of workers, they had great interest in union-management problems and other problems which affected them.

> If you get involved in theory, in academic abstractions, you lose most of them in a hurry. Most of these young people come from non-academic environments. Academic aspirations are practically non-existent. They seem to have a practical attitude towards education: 'Will education get me a better job, a better home life?' They relate education specifically to living conditions.

One of the science teachers quickly discovered that the topics which were close to home were overwhelmingly the most successful. He wanted "to give them a sugar coated pill, without the bitter aftertaste." The students were particularly fascinated with subjects such as birth defects, genetics, and human biology. They were far more interested in facts than in the superstitions which many of them had always believed, for now they knew, now they were aware, and now they could explain and predict. The instructor was amazed to discover how little most of the students knew about simple biology. They found it hard to realize that their organs were similar to those of frogs. Typing their own blood was the highlight of the term. Even the most needle-shy was so entranced that they participated. Students were absolutely amazed to discover that their blood was not special, that it was the same type as certain other members of the class. Those with rare blood types were incredulous and proud.

Students also delighted in bringing in their pet rabbits, guinea pigs, and fish to science class, much like elementary students. The learning experience was in the maintenance of the animals and the building of cages and terrariums.

All of the teachers who concentrated on topics which were close to the interests and experiences of the students were successful. The same general principle applied in the art class as well. The students, including the huskiest and the most hostile-looking young men, enthusiastically made useful items like ashtrays, rugs, and mosaic table tops, but had no use for "art for art's sake." They always had to sense that they were working towards a useful goal. When confronted with anything more abstract, such as sculpturing, they quickly lost interest.

It should not be inferred from the above discussion that what the teachers were actually doing was watering down course material to elementary levels so that the subject matter would be palatable, for this frequently was not the case. Bringing topics close to home does not imply simplifying the materials. For example, one teacher, when confronted with the Problems of Democracy book found the section on "Now you are a big man ready to face the world" so inapplicable to these life-hardened youth that he taught them basic sociology instead. He tried to present sociology as it applied to them. He used the caveman, and the institution of the family, to discuss why the male did not go over the hill to the next woman. He integrated these concepts with the students' contemporary relationships within society. The test results were amazing. They had completely mastered a new vocabulary and set of concepts because it was something that had meaning for themselves.

In all of these examples the crucial element was presenting the student with materials that he could relate closely to himself. Bringing abstractions down to the every day level made them exciting, interesting, and applicable. The students were learning things they could use and apply in daily life.

One serious problem with which the teachers had to cope was a fear of tests and grades. The successful teachers used various means of getting around this problem. One teacher, for example, graded his students on the basis of improvement rather than on an absolute basis. He used no letter grades during the term. Working on the theory that students would be more encouraged if they were confronted with their successes rather than their failures, he developed a progress profile for each student and approached them with "Have you improved?" and "Can you do better?" To alleviate test anxiety, he let them decide whether they would have "easy" or "hard" tests. This procedure amazed these students who had never before been given any choice. The instructor commented that, though the tests were certainly not easy by any standard, the label helped the students to overcome their blocks to examinations and even challenged them so that they felt compelled to answer even non-compulsory questions because they were so "easy." All of these creative approaches to teaching contributed to making school something the students wanted to come to rather than a drudgery or a source of anxiety.

Those teachers who were unsuccessful in relating to the students were equally unsuccessful in teaching them. Teaching dropouts requires sensitivity and perception as well as flexibility. The instructor must be able to alter his teaching techniques and approaches in terms of the subtle cues and messages he receives from his interactions with the students.

The unsuccessful teachers showed little evidence of creativity or flexibility in teaching. They tended to use the same lesson plan they had repeated with other students they had taught in the regular high school. They considered the most serious problem in the program to be the absence of a set text, standard tests, and lesson plans that they could follow without thought or effort. Some taught above the heads of the students, never revising their programs to the needs of the youth. Others underestimated the students' abilities and taught them nothing. The experiences with the program had little or no impact upon their regular teaching or upon them as people. Many commented that the students were very discouraged, showed no interest, or actually caused discipline problems in class.

One (it should be kept in mind that the same students were being taught) instructor in the diploma program taught with the same lesson plans he had used throughout his school career. Another teacher in the skill training program said that he too used the same outline for night classes which he used during the day, varying it only by going more slowly with these students. Another teacher began teaching theory with little or no actual shop work. Later, when the administration pointed out that many students were dropping out of the program in discouragement, the instructor switched completely to practical work, which was equally confusing to the students.

One teacher who grossly underestimated the ability of the students was so disconcerted by how little the students knew that he decided that his primary goal was to teach them the major cities of the United States. He spent most of the course on these dry details and yet was very disappointed with the test results. This teacher had observed, as had many of the best teachers, that the students were interested in events that were recent and that were close to them. He had obtained the best response in class talking about the depression which the students had heard about from their parents. In spite of these observations, he was convinced that his prime accomplishment was his effort to teach major cities. He blamed the students for their poor test performance.

An instructor in skill training was also convinced of the basic inability of the students. He thought that the course of study suggested by the administration was too advanced for "these people" because it involved physical laws and mathematics with which the vast majority of the students could not cope. This particular teacher found that they would not work if he reviewed arithmetic or started talking about algebra. He also commented that the program had the best possible equipment, but that it was far too advanced for the students. In contrast, another teacher who taught these same students later commented that he used all the equipment available and needed more materials and equipment in order to continue teaching the students.

Another teacher complained that: "All I could do was lecture. There was little student participation." This teacher and others like him were convinced that the key to success in the program was to develop standard tests, workbooks and homework assignments for the students. In fact, he continually emphasized that such measures would be the key to success with the students. Another commented

> Down here I missed a good textbook. They wanted to borrow an old junky text from the high school. I had to practically make my own course. There weren't enough books. I used work sheets. It made extra work for me and may have looked cheap to them.

Actually this particular teacher gave the students the same worksheets he had used in his many years of teaching in regular school. He did no extra work, but found the lack of texts a good scapegoat for the academic problems of the students. His commentary is full of rationalizations such as "work sheets look cheap."

Several teachers found a good scapegoat in the unavailability of a course outline. Instead of constructing one themselves, they assumed the responsibility for an outline rested with the administration. As one commented,"Some nights I had to scratch to find enough for them to do. I could have used an outline."

The dearth of flexibility among these teachers is evident in the absence of change in teaching patterns or personal approach. Many of the best and most creative teachers found themselves confronted with great personal upheavals as well as dynamic changes in their regular teaching techniques. The program had little or no impact on the lives or teaching of less sensitive teachers. One explained: "This work didn't affect my regular teaching. It's on a different plane." Similarly another comment, "Nothing I taught here had any effect on my teaching regular classes. They were different subjects."

Personal Dynamism

Personal dynamism is an essential characteristic of any teacher who is attempting to get material across to students who basically lack interest in school.

All of the better teachers were very dynamic, interested, active people who communicated forcefully their enthusiasm and concern. Dynamism is perhaps best illustrated by the techniques one of the teachers utilized to arouse his class: talking loud and soft, writing with both hands, walking among and between them, up and around all the time, addressing them individually, making spelling errors, kicking the desk, knocking over books, and rolling the wastebasket down the aisle when the class seemed to be slipping into a coma.

The dynamism of another teacher is evident in the response that she received from the students in the classroom.

> I looked forward to coming here. For once I have run into a group that likes to do what I like to do. As a group they are as enthused about this kind of work as I am. It's fun!

In fact, this teacher felt that she would rather teach these students than regular school. She comments that she would be so tired after school that she wanted to go to sleep, but once she confronted these eager, excited students she would become so immersed in teaching that she would forget her fatigue.

Other teachers impressed the students by forcefully handling discipline problems, or by actively taking interest in personal difficulties. The personal dynamism of the teacher permeated every aspect of his role with the students. Many of the best teachers communicated a great deal through their energy and activity both in the academic and the personal sense.

The unsuccessful teachers, on the other hand, lacked personal dynamism. They were unable to motivate the students or to give them a sense of direction or purpose. They made no impact. They could not communicate the value of what was happening to these students. Thus, they frequently faced discouraged, frustrated students. One classroom incident aptly projects the sense of futility. The instructor comments, "I gave them a series of problems for calculation but they said 'what's the use of doing this. It's not going to do us any good anyway.'"

Another sympathetic and interested teacher, who was simply unable to communicate in a dynamic fashion, described the difficulties he faced in the classroom.

> At times I wasn't getting across to the students. Maybe it was my fault. Maybe it was the material...Some classes were bombs. I tried talking about song form in terms of the Beatles and Brubeck but they had no background. These kids never got out of the junior high rock and roll phase...I laid an egg the first class by assuming they knew something about music. Often I wondered if I was accomplishing anything. I wondered if I deserved my paycheck.

This instructor simply could not present the material in a dynamic, interesting fashion. He could not get across to the students even with materials with tremendous potential. He apparently tended to dampen the spirit of the class. One class period he attempted to have a dance class. The situation was dead--like an afternoon social, with the girls on one side and young men on the other--until he left the room. Then everyone started dancing and having a good time.

Effort and Involvement

Many of the successful teachers found themselves far more involved in the program both emotionally and physically than they had originally anticipated. Most of them contributed significantly more to the project than was required of them. Many became so involved with the students and their problems that the demands were a real drain on them physically and emotionally. They found themselves distracted from their regular work and daily living by constant examination of the students and their relationships with them. One of the most personally and emotionally involved teachers expressed his feelings as follows:

> I spent more time preparing for this program than for my regular school. It was both physical and mental. This program disturbed me even more, to the distraction of my regular program. There is no rut, no groove here... The normal situation is a whale of a lot easier and less taxing than this program. It's like ice cream as compared to beef--they're both good but one is harder to get down. The pressure here was the needs of the group itself. There could be no baloney here. Everything had to be concrete. These kids were two-time losers... I left the program with mixed emotions. I was happy to be rid of the burden, as concerned as we all were.... These kids are on their second and probably last chance. It's more important that the job be the best job.

Another teacher echoed the same sense of the burden of responsibility implicit in working with these students:

> I am more comfortable in the regular high school. I'm a god in a high school. Everything is nice and orderly. You work on a 'percentage get it' basis. Here I have to use even more personality to teach. I wanted to keep these kids, help them to be interested, and see them get the material. You can't goof off with these kids. You can fake it in high school; send the kids to the library for a week. Here you have to work all the time. Also, I'm comfortable

> with grades there, but not here....This program has made me uncomfortable. I could do more in the high school.

All of these teachers sensed acutely, and often painfully, the desperate plight of these youth, and found themselves forced by their own conscience to do more than simply their best. As one teacher aptly expressed it: "I felt that whatever I could give them would be better than what they had." The successful teachers realized that they had to make school interesting and worthwhile to these students in order to prevent them from dropping out again and diminishing the possibility of a good future. "I wanted to make them want to come," said one teacher, "They were not a captive audience. It taxed the individual teachers to make them want to come."

All of the dedicated staff members discovered early that they had to discard their usual lesson plans and start from scratch, utilizing their ingenuity and spare time to plan lessons more appropriate to this group of people. Frequently, they had to play it by ear and be ready to adapt to new situations as they arose. Some commented that they spent hours in informal meetings with fellow teachers discussing the students and ways to reach them. One group of teachers in particular set up a coordinated curriculum with reading skills, science, literature, and social studies.

Obtaining equipment and materials in an experimental program on a limited budget is inevitably a problem. Many teachers found themselves searching out materials on their own time. English teachers collected paperbacks from the local bookstores; the art teacher carefully planned and purchased art supplies for two terms of work; teachers at the technical school, when confronted with limited appliances in the repair shop, recruited appliances from other students and faculty and also solicited old machinery from manufacturing companies; science teachers made their own laboratory tables and equipment such as terrariums so that the students could have access to more equipment than the budget allowed.

The concern, the interest, the awareness that this was the last chance for many of these youth spurred the good teacher into constant rumination and activity outside the classroom.

Most of the unsuccessful teachers basically lacked the interest and the concern with the program to make an effort beyond the minimum required. They did not become wrapped-up in the problems of the students, they did not begin calling them "their kids," as did the successful teachers. They were no closer to, and often less in contact with, these students than those in their regular classes.

Many of the poorer teachers complained that this job was too difficult and that they preferred to work with their regular students for this reason. One teacher commented:

> My regular job suits me best, I don't think I'd want to be a full-time teacher for this type of group. It's too strenuous to have to get a new group in, start weeding them out. It's easier to teach a regular group. They have a better background.

This teacher not only finds the effort too great, but also lacks involvement to the degree that he is among the advocates of flunking out and selecting people carefully.

Some of these latter teachers alleviated part of the work load by getting the students to do their work for them, rationalizing, naturally, that this was far more beneficial to the students. One teacher had a real system worked out:

> I'd give them a job and see who did well. Then I'd let them help the other students. They liked this. The teacher coming around they wouldn't be as comfortable with me as with someone from their own class.

While this could be a useful technique, if carefully supervised, there was little evidence that the necessary supervision was provided.

Lack of effort was evident with several of the teachers in more concrete forms. As mentioned before, several used the same lesson plans they used with regular students. Another said that he gave the same test to these students at the end of the term that he gave to his high school students for two months of work.

Little effort implies a lack of involvement in the program and the students. This is borne out by the difference in comments between these instructors and the successful teachers. One such disinterested teacher commented "I know the students better at the regular school because I have them for a longer period of time." (Contrast this with the intensive concern and involvement of some of the other teachers.) This same attitude was expressed by another teacher who reported that the staff seldom sat down to talk over problems because they did not have enough time, because "most of us were working two jobs and had to go home and get some sleep."

ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE STUDENTS

Regardless of his efforts to mask them, negative attitudes on the part of the teacher towards his students are inevitably projected in subtle but nonetheless lethal forms; particuarly, because students as sensitive to rejection as these sensed any undercurrent of disapproval or of condescension. Naturally they will react as they have always reacted to rejection and disfavor with hostility and withdrawal. Consequently the attitude of the teacher is one of the most crucial variables which contributes to the success or failure of any program attempting to cope with people who have failed socially, personally, or academically in society. One of the inherent qualities of the successful teacher is a positive and frequently overwhelmingly accepting attitude towards the dropout. The attitudes of some of the most valuable teachers in the project are discussed in the following paragraphs.

During the first few weeks of the program the successful teacher developed an overwhelmingly positive attitude towards the students, even if his original impression was negative. Working with these youth, showing interest and concern, even if at first it was on a more superficial level, he quickly discovered that the students opened up eagerly and warmly when confronted with acceptance. The budding relationship between teacher and student gradually elicited the best in their respective personalities and they became better people for the experience.

Several teachers, confronting these students for the first time, were literally horrified. As one instructor vividly recounts, "The first night that I walked in I knew that I had made a mistake... My heart stopped, dropped, and I could see myself engaged in fisticuffs with 35 different boys all coming at me at once--belligerent Negroes, terrible tough whites, and snotty girls."

Another, who eventually taught through the complete program, initially was thoroughly frightened and convinced that neither he nor the program would last. He honestly reconstructs his middle-class revulsion in the following comment:

> After I left that meeting I wouldn't have given the program a year. They were surly. They didn't seem to be receptive at all. Some of them seemed rather unclean, dirty. The social attitude we have towards this type of person in regards to morals and 'what have you' is strong. You knew that many of those girls were out because of pregnancies--one, two, perhaps three times. You knew some of the people had scrapes with the law. I wouldn't have given them the distinction of being human beings. Their learning potential seemed to be nothing.

Yet these same two teachers became among the most ardent supporters of these students, their students. The teacher first quoted became keenly, desperately aware that this was their last chance, and he was determined to do everything he could for them. He felt that he was under tremendous emotional and physical pressure in the program because of the needs of the group. There could be no "baloney" here, for these kids were two-time losers. The other enthusiastically related that these kids were so eager--like elementary kids, always waving their hands--because they have found someone who would listen to them and to their problems.

Many teachers were impressed by the maturity, determination, personality and intellectual capacity of the students. The depth of their admiration and affection for these youth is evident in the degree to which they became involved with them. Many teachers discovered that they felt more concern for these students than for their regular high school students, and this concern helped them to be more sympathetic and sensitive. They realized that many of these students, faced rejection by family and society for pregnancy out of wedlock, for scholastic failure, or for delinquent actions, were discouraged, alienated, and lost. The teachers saw that after several years of failure the students were grasping at straws in their attempts to find a place in society. They were determined to give their best to these young people.

Many teachers related with great concern and amazement the overwhelming problems of students working full-time supporting their parents and family, and still managing to spend that extra four hours a day in school. Some were truly incredulous when commenting on the endurance of their students. They found that: "...these kids are more motivated than regular students; they're more worldly-wise. They are motivated by their own physical situation and by the type of program." Many teachers were surprised to discover that the range of intelligence of these students encompassed both bright and slow students. They found their ability generally higher than they had anticipated.

Working and interacting with these people they discovered that they had admirable personal characteristics. As one teacher, who reflected the attitudes of all the successful teachers, commented, "These kids have tremendous problems and tremendous personalities. I was lucky to teach them. [They have] something above the ordinary--they stuck it out." One of the youngest instructors made an interesting comparison between these youth and her own companions:

> The maturity of the students is greater here. They have had some serious responsibilities forced upon them. They are serious. They are more in touch with reality than many of my young friends. Many have other people dependent on them. My own peers don't have these problems.

Teacher attitude in some cases was crucial to the handling of discipline problems in ways which did not alienate the student and possibly contribute to his withdrawal from school. For example, one boy, convinced that he was the only student in class who was ready to work, hoarded all the classroom supplies, and when forced to surrender them, threw his own work out the window. When instructed to retrieve it, he returned empty handed, claiming he could not find them. Although the teacher felt compelled to take some form of disciplinary action, and therefore asked the supervisor to talk to the youth, she handled the situation with understanding and, privately, with some amusement. She realized that he felt that he had been wronged. As she commented in the interview, "He is really a darling boy, but he's rambunctious. He's more childish than the others, and younger." Certainly an insensitive and heavy handed approach to this student could have been damaging. Parenthetically, this same teacher recalls that the first few days of class, when she first saw some of the "hoody" students, she wondered whether or not she would make it out through the alley to her car.

Perhaps the key to the positive attitude of these teachers is that they perceived these students not as stereotypes but as people, struggling with more problems and burdens than most, and they, as teachers, extended their hands to help. To them these students were special. They were hard workers, they were enthusiastic, they were persevering and determined. Many of the students had ability; all of them had desire. These teachers admired the students and thus there was nothing condescending or derogatory in their approach. They saw each one as an individual and thus there was no room for stereotyping or prejudice. Through their sensitive, insightful efforts they brought out the best in these youth, and responded with the best in themselves.

In contrast to this acceptance of the students found among the successful teachers, the unsuccessful teachers tended to hold one or more of four basically negative attitudes all of which served to lower their regard for the students. The first of these attitudes was that the program was useless--a waste of time and money. The second was class or color prejudice. The third was heavily stereotyping people and putting them into pat categories. The fourth, and last, was a general condescension towards the students.

One such teacher made it amply clear in a less than subtle way at least three times during the interview that he considered the entire program a waste of money. His own comments are revealing:

> This program was an experimentation. You learn from it. Some people think the money is wasted and ill-spent. But a lot of it is wasted in industrial experiments, too, but you learn from it....Some teachers felt it was a waste of money. But I can't say that everyone felt this way. If I thought it was a complete waste of money I wouldn't come over here and talk to you. [Incidentally, the teachers were paid for the interview.]

Some teachers held this attitude towards the programs because they were convinced that the students could not be improved, or at least that the majority of them were beyond help. Because of this attitude some of them expected little of the students, an expectation which the youths naturally fulfilled. One instructor commented, "I think it was a general feeling of everyone out there, an undercurrent--'They're dropouts, don't expect too much from them.'" Needless to say this attitude severely handicapped students and teachers alike. Comments such as "The dead wood weeds itself out" or "The students should have been selected better, or screened" indicate a whole pattern of attitudes and approaches which were detrimental.

Prejudice was one of the least obvious of the negative attitudes expressed. Racial prejudice particularly was heavily disguised, since it is no longer popular to proclaim such attitudes. Class prejudice was more prevalent, particularly among those instructors who themselves had moved from lower-class background to a marginal position in middle-class society. These people tend to be irritated by those attitudes and behaviors they consider to be the cause of low status in society. Such teachers implied that it was through their own efforts they rose from lower-class backgrounds. If the dropouts would only work hard, pay attention, come to class regularly, etc., they too could rise.

The prejudiced expectations towards colored students are evident in the following comment of one teacher. "Some students were smarter than I thought. Some of them were colored people, too. I was afraid some of the colored people might be below. But some of the colored were better than some of the white." Pat phrases about colored people being equal, or the same, or better than the white students, or about treating the students the same regardless of color were typical of many of these teachers. Many of the phrases were a little too pat. Class prejudice was more evident, as is obvious in the following quote:

> You're dealing with a class of people you are always going to have. It's subject to environment and heredity, I suppose. It's partly a lack of motivation and application plus their God-given ability and unfortunately, they don't have much. They didn't inherit much.

Typically, the unsuccessful teachers stereotyped the students instantly, thus eliminating any chance of close interpersonal interaction and automatically distorting and hampering the attempt of the student to make an impression upon the teacher. Whereas the attitudes of the successful teachers were changed radically, among the poorer teachers, the stereotyped idea of a dropout was unchanged despite the experience of interacting with the students. This stereotype is evident in the comments of some of the more rigid teachers:

> They have common characteristics. I notice their common mode of dress--shirt tails hanging out, no socks, and now long hair, the Beatles' style. I've observed them at the pool halls. They're not making any

> effort to better themselves. They're living for today, period... Dropouts generally have low ability, and are lazy, but not hopeless.

The perfect example of stereotype of the most insidious, uninsightful, and dangerous variety comes from one instructor who was trying to impress the interviewer with his high opinion of, and interest in, the students. This passage has already been quoted but it warrants repeating:

> Nine times out of ten they [dropouts] are not dummies. The real dumb kids will stick it out and not cause any trouble. The teachers will pass them. But the kid with spunk, who asks questions, causes trouble, makes some of the teachers burned up. Some teachers don't want to answer questions but these are the kids you want to play along with, they're the ones who will amount to something, not the ones who sit in the corner. My best behaved students have turned into murderers, suicides, robbers. They're antagonistic to society, the loner types. But they're not leaving school though they're not worth a hoot outside.

Any instructor with such rigid, pigeon-hole answers to questions is a serious detriment to these students in the classroom. "Dumb kids," "dummies," and "nice kids" are constant words in his vocabulary. Other examples of stereotypes were the trite cliches which the interviewer received from some teachers. One, in attempting to explain his conception of the basic philosophy and outlook of the program said: "The idea that I'm here to help you be a better person...like a religious conversion. Jesus says 'you must be born again.'"

One of the most detrimental attitudes towards the self concept of the student is condescension. Several teachers developed the habit of giving little pep talks to students. One replied, when asked why the students stayed in the program: "I think I helped a little. I'd keep telling them to keep it up. I can see an improvement every week. You get nothing for nothing. I know you'll have to be absent sometimes, but try to keep it up. I tried to stimulate them to come by doing this about a half hour each week." Another teacher constantly lectured his colored students: "I would tell them not to have self-pity. [I told them.] I have placed colored people in jobs in the day program, but no one's going to hand it to you." These constant patronizing pep talks, despite all good intentions, have a demoralizing effect on the students when they are repeated and repeated. The way to help these students is by more subtle methods. The pep talk approach assumes a childlike nature on the part of the students which was non-existent. They have seen and lived too much to respond to this type of exhortation.

Another teacher attempted to reach the student's level by constantly using Negro slang, tone quality, and accent when addressing them, no doubt in what he perceived as an effort to "come down to their level." He even did this for the interviewer's benefit, apparently feeling that it was clever. These students need models whom they can approach rather than individuals who approach them in a patronizing fashion.

As a rule, among the unsuccessful teachers, the general evaluation of the students was poor. They considered them to be immature, unmotivated and lazy, of inferior personality and ability. One teacher commented,

> The group wasn't initially too much different from school children of their age. These kids had a more varied experience, not necessarily the best kind of experience. Many had problems in their family, some had children. Many of them did not have husbands. Talking to them didn't seem different from high school students.

Another comments that his students were very immature: "Their attention span is very short. You had to keep them busy or they'd get into mischief. They are very immature. I felt that was one of the reasons they're there in the position they are now." These descriptions stand in sharp contrast to those given by the successful teachers.

The poorer instructors typically also saw the students as lacking in motivation and determination. They blamed their attitudes for any problem in the classroom. One teacher comments,

> There are at least five or six in each class who are sincere about going on in school and their attendance is good so they're bound to get ahead, but the others thought 'maybe I'll go two or three days a week and they'll hand me a diploma and I can always use that.'

This instructor had little awareness of the complex problems and attitudes that prevented so many of the students from coming to school and he attributed them to laziness. This teacher has the same attitude about another student who was trying to obtain a high school diploma so that he could go to the General Motors Mechanics School. This teacher felt that this student was trying to find the easy way to a high school diploma. What other ways were open to the youth is questionable. This teacher's general evaluation of the students was: "This group lacks the desire to learn. I have to motivate them and pick up the threads of learning from five or six years ago."

These poorer instructors also felt that the students were lacking in basic ability. As one teacher put it: "These students didn't have the basic ability or patience." Thus, many of these instructors, as mentioned previously, advocated weeding out the students so that those with the ability would remain. In general, they assumed that they were not capable of high quality work.

These basically negative attitudes seemed to stem from a lack of sensitivity to people and a lack of understanding of the factors that cause people to act as they do. Many teachers were at a loss to deal with anything as complex and challenging as these students. Many were frustrated by the intangible nature of success, and the lack of pat answers and easy results. One teacher exemplified these characteristics when he was asked how satisfied he was with what he had accomplished in the program:

> House painting is satisfying. You can stand back at the end of the day and see what you've done. You often wonder how much I accomplish and what influence I have at the end of the school year. You can't put your hand on the rewards. You can only say 'I hope I did a little.'

SUMMARY

This chapter attempted to describe the attributes of successful and unsuccessful teachers in the teaching of school dropouts who, for the most part, came from the disadvantaged segment of our society. These attributes include: (1) an ability on the part of the teacher to relate to students; (2) his ability to teach them; and (3) his attitude towards them.

It was noted that the ability to relate to the student included a student-oriented approach to teaching, insightfulness, personal flexibility, a tendency to initial self-evaluation, and a willingness to assume the role of a "listener" or of a counselor.

"Teaching success" depended on flexibility and creativity in approaching a teaching situation, personal dynamism, and a willingness to expend effort and energy beyond the minimum required--that is, a high level of professionalism.

Attitude requires a projection of a positive, accepting, and caring personality in a personal, social, and academic sense.

In general, the teachers in the skill training program did not exhibit these characteristics. The diploma program included both types of teachers.

These conclusions are consistent with those set forth in Chapter II, which explains what received theory tells us about dropouts. In effect, the experimental program can be looked upon as a re-affirmation of the knowledge described in Chapter II.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

To this point the various activities and results of the experimental programs have been presented in separate chapters. This chapter attempts to bring these various aspects together. There are two main sections in the chapter. The first section summarizes the approaches and results of the two experimental programs and presents the reasons why they were not equally successful. The second section presents certain recommendations which are designed to make schools more suitable agencies for the assistance of young people who come from poverty environments.

SUMMARY

Basic Assumptions and Approaches

In developing the experimental programs it was recognized, on the one hand, that the diploma program and the skill training program had to be typical of their type so that the results of the research could have realistic application. On the other hand, it was also recognized that since the programs being developed were for students who had dropped out of school, some changes would have to be made in existing philosophy, organization, and methodology or too many of the factors that operated to cause students to drop out the first time would remain to operate again and cause them to drop out of the experimental programs. The goal was to have a least fifty students in each program at the conclusion of the instructional period.

The basic assumption was made that students and teachers would not derive satisfaction from an instructional situation and therefore, would not remain a part of it unless positive interpersonal relationships were developed. The term "interpersonal relationships" as used here is meant to represent the cumulative effects of all human interaction within any particular situation. In its report to the President in November 1966, the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children found teacher-pupil relationships the single most significant factor in determining the success of summer programs for disadvantaged students. Their findings are summarized as follows:

> *In distinguishing those classrooms that favorably impressed consultants from those that appeared poor, the explanatory factor most frequently observed was the difference in the quality of relationships--the rapport--between teacher and child.* [Wilson, 1966, p. 3, emphasis in the original]
>
> Above all the factors in improving education... one was identified by observer after observer as a necessary ingredient in substantial change--and the greatest hurdle standing in the way of change. This is the quality of the relationship between the teacher and the child. In speaking of this ingredient, the observers were not alluding merely to the techniques of teaching, although that factor, too, got its share of attention. The differences between success and failure in projects they visited, the observers said again and again, pivoted on the subtle aspects of mutual understanding, commonness of purpose, and warm human contact between teacher and pupil which they described by the word 'rapport.' [Wilson, 1966, p. 15]

During the development of the high school diploma program, efforts were made to structure each instructional situation to create opportunities for the development of positive interactions. There were many links in the chain of interaction that began with the University and relationships between members of the project staff. These included: the project staff's relationships with the administrators of the program; the administrators' relationships with the teachers; the teachers' relationships with each other; the teachers' relationships with the students; and, finally, the students' relationships with each other. Considering what is known concerning school rejection by the culturally deprived, it seems safe to assume that any failure in this vital chain of relationships could have resulted in the creation of conditions conducive to school rejection. Similar efforts were made in the skill training program, but because of the administrator these were not successful. This problem is discussed at greater length below in the subsection titled "The Importance of the Administration."

In the planning of the programs it was recognized that young persons who are the products of a poverty culture commonly have a weakness in verbal ability. Their environment seems to produce a different approach to learning. Verbal abstractions have little relevance and communication takes place through a greater variety of physical means. There is a need to manipulate objects, tools, and equipment. Sensory learning--seeing, hearing, feeling, tasting--is more compatible than learning through vicarious verbal experiences.

Unfortunately the culturally disadvantaged student is continually exposed to school experiences that require the use and development of his lesser abilities. The child is required to spend most of the time doing the things that he can do least well and is required to view problems and reach solutions through means which are least compatible to him. Under these conditions it is not difficult to understand why failure is common and why negative attitudes develop. It also is easy to understand why a teacher faced with certain required outcomes set by his superiors and also faced with students who constantly fail in their attempts to achieve these outcomes can become most negative toward the failing students. The reaction of both the teacher and students to their mutual frustration represents the nadir of student-teacher relationships. These experiences produce the negative attitudes and learning deficiencies which result years later in school withdrawal.

It was anticipated that the subjects recruited for this study would bring these problems back to school with them. The first order of priority was thus to overcome these negative attitudes. Once the student no longer regarded the teacher as an enemy, the process of overcoming educational deficiencies could begin.

The interview and test results that were reported in Chapters III, IV, and V indicated that the expectations on which the programs were based were well-founded. The subjects were predominantly from poverty environments. There was considerable family instability with approximately one-third of the sample living on welfare. While most of the subjects reported they had had academic difficulties in school, the major reasons for leaving school involved discipline infractions.

The test results confirmed the interviews. The achievement tests showed the subjects' average performance to be at an elementary school or junior high school level--considerably below that of an average high school student. They performed at this level even though their mean tested IQ, both verbal and nonverbal, was well within normal limits. This discrepancy between ability and achievement indicates the degree to which the schools had failed to teach and these students had failed to learn in the traditional setting.

Part of the reason for this failure rests in the verbal demands of the schools interacting with the verbal deficiency of the students. While both the mean verbal and mean nonverbal IQs were within normal limits, the nonverbal IQ was significantly higher. This finding confirmed another expectation as to the characteristics of the subjects. Because of their verbal deficiencies, the emphasis on traditional lecture-textbook type courses was to be minimized and methods that stimulated student involvement were to be stressed.

Teaching methods that brought forth student participation served another purpose. They provided the teachers with opportunities to demonstrate their interest in and concern for the students. The successful teachers were able to communicate this interest and concern.

All the Teachers Were not Effective

The critical variables that separated the successful from the unsuccessful teachers were primarily attitudinal. The teachers who worked effectively with the students cared about them as individuals. They had insight into the personal characteristics and motivations of the students and were aware of the difficulties many of them were trying to overcome. This awareness caused the successful teachers to put extra effort into attempting to communicate with the students. The students responded to this obvious involvement on the part of the teachers. Instead of avoiding the learning situation--a response that they had learned in previous school settings--they responded to the teacher and found they could, indeed, learn.

Before learning could take place, however, the negative attitudes and anxieties aroused by the school situation had to be overcome. And these attitudes were very reasonable when considered in light of the regular school experiences of these dropouts. To them school had been an unpleasant experience where they had been constantly reminded that they were less important and less worthy than their more academically adept classmates.

The teachers who were aware of these attitudes were able to counteract them. They designed their courses so that the students could master the subject matter. They understood that the students' initial belligerence was a defense against expected frustration and rejection. Consequently, the students' latent hostility did not bring forth counter-hostility on the part of the teacher. The long cycle of mutual expectations of failure and rejection on the part of both the teachers and the students was finally broken. In other school settings these expectations had brought forth the kind of behavior that confirmed the expectations. The successful teachers were able to break the cycle by not acting towards the students as other teachers had in the past. They accepted and reacted to each student as an individual rather than as a "dummy" or "trouble maker."

In general the unsuccessful teachers were not able to accept the students as individuals. They responded to the stereotype of the dropout rather than to the separate students they taught. They ascribed the dropouts' difficulties to character defects which could be overcome by personal deligence. Since these teachers believed the problem lay with the nature of the student, it was the responsibility of the student to make any adjustments necessary for them to benefit from the program. But basically these teachers had little faith in the ability of the dropouts to make such adjustments. They believed that the dropouts' limited natural ability and lack of initiative prevented them from doing so.

These basically negative attitudes towards the students reduced the effectiveness of the teachers who held them. These teachers complained of obtaining little response from the students. The successful teachers, on the other hand, remarked about the enthusiasm of their students. The poorer teachers were skeptical of the worth of the program. The good teachers saw it as a "last chance" for students that the regular school had failed to serve. The poorer teachers taught these students in much the same way they taught their regular classes and learned little from their participation in the program. The better teachers constantly attempted to find new ways to reach the students and found that their regular teaching was being affected.

In short, the successful teachers, so rated both by their supervisors and from their taped interviews, were concerned about the students and interested in the program. Their concern was communicated to the students. The students responded to this concern by actively cooperating with the teacher, and the learning experience was no longer a conflict with the teachers on one side and the students on the other. Instead, both were partners in a mutual venture.

The Two Programs Were not Equally Successful

The supportive atmosphere and the concern of the teachers were not established to the same degree in both of the programs. All data indicate the diploma program was the more successful in terms of these criteria. The retention rate was more than double (52 per cent in the diploma program to 23 per cent in the skill program). The test results showed the diploma graduates improved their reading and arithmetic skills while the skill training graduates did not. The measures of self-esteem showed the same differential pattern with some evidence that the self-esteem of the skill training graduates actually decreased during the program.

The interviews with the graduates also confirmed the greater success of the diploma program. The diploma graduates were more convinced of the future usefulness of the education they had received. When the subjects were asked what it was they liked about the program, one-fourth of the diploma graduates mentioned the general tone and administration. None of the skill training graduates volunteered this response.

Experiences in the diploma program, the most important of which was successfully completing it, appeared to have increased the self-confidence of the diploma graduates. A series of questions on future intentions and expectations revealed that those subjects who completed the diploma program were more convinced than any of the other subjects of their ability to control their own future. These kinds of changes, while very difficult to substantiate, were the overall goals of the experimental program.

Why Was the Diploma Program More Successful?

The Importance of the Administration. A weighing of all the available data points to the difference in the attitudinal tone or "atmosphere" of the two programs as one of the major reasons for the difference in their relative success. This difference in tone appeared to stem largely from the different attitudes of their administrators towards the value of the programs.

The school administrator is the bridge between society and the classroom. His attitudes towards culturally disadvantaged students and his interpretation of his responsibilities to them as communicated by him both to the community and to his teachers may significantly influence how his teachers teach. In summarizing the findings of their study of administrative relationships Guba and Bidwell (1957) clarify this process:

> To a considerable degree, then, the operation of an organization seems to be dependent upon the perceptions of the organization's administrators. Innovations in organizational procedure, changes in organizational structure and shifts in personnel, for example, all proceed largely from the administrator's evaluation of the effectiveness of these aspects of his organization. Insofar as such ratings are a function of his own frame of reference and modes of perception, then those factors contributing to the administrator's world-view, such as his structure of needs, his reference-group identifications, and his values, all have import for the ways in which he will delineate the organization's goals and structure its activities. [pp. 65-66]

Unfortunately, many of those in positions of educational leadership do not appear to understand the problems of students from backgrounds of poverty, or to accept, as part of their professional responsibility, the education of the public and its specific representatives to the educational needs of these students. Educational leadership tends to react; it does not act. As a result, public education remains largely irrelevant to the needs of the culturally deprived student.

By the time the disadvantaged student arrives in secondary school, he has reacted to the inappropriateness of his educational experiences and the evidence available indicates that he has developed a powerful set of negative attitudes towards almost everything associated with school. It may be assumed that if teachers and administrators identify strongly with the middle-class standards and values that perpetuate the existing educational establishment, they will reject the culturally disadvantaged student as being unworthy, incorrigible, or incompetent. The teacher who identifies more strongly with his culturally deprived students than with administrators, who possess predominantly negative attitudes towards the disadvantaged, is likely to be at constant odds with the school and its administration. Regardless of how energetically teachers apply their professional skills, they cannot bridge the gap between disadvantaged students and middle class expectations.

How can teachers feel positive towards students if, by their inability to function in the traditional school environment, the disadvantaged students cause the teachers to fail to achieve the expectations of the administration and of the community? The teacher of the disadvantaged, unless supported by an agency like the U.S. Office of Education, representing an authority viewed as higher than the local school district, is often caught, therefore, between student needs and administration demands. Teacher frustration and negativism are inevitable in this situation.

It would seem most appropriate that the first step in building an effective educational program for economically deprived students should be to secure the leadership of administrators who have positive attitudes toward these students and who are deeply concerned about their problems. These administrators must be willing and able to work toward significant changes in the level of understanding and in the attitudes of both the professional staff and the community. It must be recognized that, in order to provide appropriate educational experiences for disadvantaged students, it will be necessary to make basic changes in school organization and curriculum. It will be necessary to develop new standards to replace the externalized standards represented by traditional testing and grading practices and procedures. These traditional practices include: the expectation that students will reach certain levels of development at specific times; the view that students will spend most of their time listening, reading and writing; the idea that classrooms are quiet study areas where primarily sedentary activities take place. Where administrators fail to work toward changes in these expectations and the value systems that underlie them, teachers of the disadvantaged are faced with doing the impossible.

During the development of the diploma program, many meetings with teachers were devoted to the exploration of various aspects of the organization of the traditional high school. The values that underlie these traditional procedures and practices were reexamined. Through these discussions, the teachers were able to understand that the University staff and the administration of the school understood the condition of the disadvantaged and desired to adjust the school program to their needs. Teachers developed the understanding that the administration had different expectations concerning the conduct of the educational program, the evaluation of student progress, student conduct, attendance, etc., than usually are encountered. Teachers freely reacted to each other's ideas and influenced them. One of the most difficult problems to overcome was the need, expressed by some of the teachers, to cling to the more middle class oriented methods of evaluation. They were afraid, at first, that students might not "earn" their diplomas. It is clear from the analysis of teacher attitudes that this concern did not persist.

The cumulative effect of the staff discussions that were held was to liberate teachers from the feelings of guilt, inadequacy, and failure that might have developed had they incorrectly judged administrative expectations and tried to approach their classes with their habitual attitudes and expectations. They were freed from the fear of disapproval that they might have experienced when they contemplated doing something new or different. In this way, a climate of acceptance was firmly established before teachers and students even met. Efforts were made to prevent those situations from developing which could compel teachers to reject students.

The situation was completely reversed in the skill training program. Soon after the program was in operation it became apparent that the administrator was not in sympathy with its aims. He held basically negative attitudes towards the students and, when interviewing prospective teachers, it was occasionally reported that he made these views known.

There is other evidence of these attitudes besides the personal experiences of those associated with the project. The report published by the agency that conducted the skill training program provides an example. Thirty-three of the 81 pages in this report are devoted to reports by social workers on students who had poor attendance in the skill training program. The general tone of these reports is that the extensive personal and family problems of these students made it impossible for them to attend more regularly. To quote the summary of these reports:

> In summary, social service investigations of the attendance problems...revealed that all of these students were poor risks for such a project. The opportunity offered them was not really wanted or appreciated in most cases. A few had legitimate reasons for being absent and may return to school. The majority, however, had little or no interest in the program and had no particular goals. The families seen were the typical chronically dependent ones with long histories of such things as welfare existence; juvenile court records; unemployment; illegitimacy; and inadequate coping patterns. Children from these homes have been conditioned to self-defeating behavior and are poor risks in a rehabilitation program based only on an environmental plan they were expected to carry out in an independent way.

This summary undoubtably accurately portrays the attitude of the students when they were contacted. These contacts were made in June, July, and August 1966.[1] But by this time the program had been in operation from nine to eleven months. The initial interest which had led the students to enter it had long since disappeared.

---

[1] Since the visits of the social workers were conducted so late in the program, it appears that they were conducted not in an attempt to aid the students but merely to provide an explanation for the poor attendance and high attrition in the skill training program. The inclusion in the final report of the reports of the social workers on each student visited also appears to be an attempt to attribute the reason for the poor performance of the skill training program to the characteristics of its students.

The "self-defeating behavior" referred to in the quotation was amply stimulated by the attitudes of the teachers, the lack of equipment and supplies, and the repetitious nature of the instruction. The students found once again that what society promised and what it delivered were much at variance. The expectations of frustration and rejection, that initially the students were motivated enough to overcome, were only too well confirmed. Instead of the program providing the support necessary for continuation, it supplied the conditions that brought forth the students more accustomed behavior of failure and withdrawal.

It is true that many of the problems which these students manifested required more help than the project was able to provide. The diploma program, despite its more supportive atmosphere, had an attrition rate of 48 per cent. This is significantly less, however, than the 77 per cent attrition rate in the skill training program. The test results show that this difference cannot be attributed to differences in the characteristics of the students assigned to the two programs. The difference in the effectiveness of the two programs apparently was mainly the result of the differing attitudes of their administrators and the majority of their teachers towards the students.

Most of the remaining 48 pages in the final report of the skill training program represent further attempts to blame the students for the program's lack of success.

The report includes copies of warning letters sent to students with poor attendance, correspondence with a proprietor of a luncheonette concerning the behavior of students who waited there for the school bus, a letter complaining about the behavior of the students from a student who withdrew, and recommendations that are so at odds with the actual operation of the program as to be ludicrous. For example, it is stated: "It became apparent that courses of this nature require exceptionally well trained teachers with considerable flexibility, ingenuity, and motivation." It did not appear that any attempt was made to provide such teachers. Another recommendation was that, "Academic courses (reading, writing, math, etc.) be 'built-in' as part of the occupational training." The attempts of the University to introduce such instruction were specifically rejected by the administration. There are also 14 pages of pictures with captions that just do not fit with the negative tone of the rest of the report: "A delightful pause after solving a complex problem in wiring and trouble shooting," is an example.

The Importance of the Attitudes of the Teachers. Out of the eight teachers in both programs who were rated as successful, seven were from the diploma program. In the diploma program all the students were exposed to these teachers. Each evening of school was divided into four periods and each period was taught by a different teacher. The successful teachers were thus able to offset any negative effects of the less successful teachers. In the skill training program the arrangement was different. The students had the same teacher for four and one-half hours. In addition, the one successful teacher in this program taught for only about one-third of the year. He demonstrated that these students could be reached, but there were not enough teachers in this program with his abilities.

The qualities that made some of the teachers successful were not related to their technical competence. They were related to the way these teachers viewed the nature of people. The common sense interpretation of human behavior, which characterized the ineffective teachers, is not adequate for an understanding of the behavior of people whose life styles differ radically from one's own. If an individual is attempting to understand the behavior of someone who comes from a similar environment, evaluating the other person's behavior in terms of one's own can be instructive. But to apply one's own frame of reference to an individual from a different culture can be vastly misleading. This seems to have been one of the crucial problems which the unsuccessful teachers could not overcome.

The view which helps one to understand human behavior sees it as the result of specifiable antecedents which lead to predictable consequences. It recognizes the way in which an individual's environment conditions his total perception of the world. It realizes that people often act in response to motives of which they themselves are not totally aware. And, while it acknowledges that people must be held accountable for their actions, it takes the position that at the time an act is committed it is the only one possible.

This view, of course, is drawn from modern behavioral science. Many of the teachers in the diploma program held this view, and it added to their effectiveness. Not that it alone was the answer. Some teachers revealed in their interviews that they regarded behavior within this general framework and yet they were not effective. And, though none of the skill training teachers viewed behavior in this way, one, because of the nature of his own personality, was able to work effectively with the students. But, other things equal, the teacher with this approach will be more effective than the teacher without it--especially when working with students from a different cultural milieu.

The ineffective teachers, in general, did not take the behavioral science view. Instead they tended to regard behavior as the result of the basic moral character of the individual. Behavior was viewed in terms of will power and personal determination rather than as the result of socialization to a particular set of cultural norms.

Why were there so many more effective teachers in the diploma program? A large part of the answer was due to the difference in the administration. The administrator of the diploma program selected teachers who he thought were capable of creating the proper mood in the classroom. He then worked with these teachers to help them create it.

There is no evidence the administrator of the skill training program made a similar effort. But even if he had made such an effort it would have been very difficult for him to obtain vocational teachers with the proper qualifications. State regulations require that the skilled trades be taught by journeymen and that the teachers of all vocational areas have some actual work experience. Many of these teachers have the minimum amount of college credits necessary for certification--those holding temporary certificates have less. College credits cannot insure that those who have acquired them hold scientifically valid conceptions of human nature. But they can insure exposure to some of the modern thinking in psychology, sociology, and education. If a teacher wishes to hold another view of human nature after such exposure, that is his choice. But the choice should be made with the knowledge that an alternative explanation is available. And when people are exposed to modern behavioral science, many accept it as more valid than the ideas they previously held.

Most of the ineffective teachers had another handicap which interacted with their limited understanding of human behavior. They came from socio-economic backgrounds where there was strong emphasis on upward occupational mobility. Families with this orientation stress the importance of hard work, conscientiousness, fulfilling responsibilities, postponing immediate gratification, planning for the future, etc. People who have internalized these values find the behavior of those from different backgrounds very irritating. The symptoms of poverty--unemployment, welfare, illegitimacy--are seen as a desire "to get something for nothing," as laziness, as self-indulgence. Poor people have a life style which the upwardly mobile has been taught to fear worse than death itself. To the upwardly mobile, the fact that poor people live this way means that they must want to. If they did not want to, they would get a job, any job, and live a "decent" life.

It is true that most public school teachers, both vocational and nonvocational, come from the same type of family background. The difference in their attitudes appears to be related to the type of preparation they have received. The broad training which the college prepared teacher receives tends, in many cases, to counteract the effects of their background. Most of the successful teachers admitted in their interviews that at first they were repelled by the appearance and attitudes of the students. But since they were able to understand both the reasons for the students' behavior and their own reactions they were able to overcome their initial rejection of the students. The vocational teacher, particularly in the trade and industrial programs, who has not had the benefit of a broad preparation, enters the classroom with his class prejudices intact.

Ironically, it is vocational teachers who are being given the major responsibility for teaching poor people the way to earn a living. The emphasis in much recent legislation, such as the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Economic Opportunity Act, is on teaching salable skills to people who presently have none. As this type of training has progressed, more and more attention has been directed to the "hard core" unemployed. These trainees are drawn from people living in a poverty culture. They exhibit all the traits which irritate and alienate their teachers. Their teachers, in turn, respond by rejecting the students, actually forcing them out of their classes, or else give up and do not attempt to teach. The student then either drops out and confirms his own self-image as a failure who should not try for a place in the larger society, or merely puts in time to qualify for the training allowance. If poor people are really to be helped something more is needed. That something is teachers who can reach students from a different culture because they can understand them. Methods of developing such teachers and more effective programs for the disadvantaged are discussed in the next section. Before that, however, two final observations relevant to the success of the diploma program are presented.

The Importance of the Diploma. It was apparent to the personnel associated with the project, and confirmed by the interviews of the graduates, that the anticipation of obtaining a high school diploma had considerable incentive motivation. It represented to the students a tangible sign that they were going to achieve one of the major goals set for adolescents in our society. The possession of this certificate meant that they no longer would be classified as outcasts and failures. The students, of course, also hoped it would open doors to employment that had previously been closed. Beyond its practical value, however, was its psychological value. To these students it signified acceptance and approval by a previously rejecting society.

The opportunity to obtain skill training--at least of the type that was taught--apparently did not have the same incentive value. The students in the skill program were given the opportunity to prepare for and to take the General Educational Development test. Workbooks were provided and the students were allowed to work on these during part of their classes.[2] A special testing session was arranged for the participants in the study.

The reading problems of these students, however, made self-instruction quite difficult. The students tried, but the total program was not geared to prepare them for the test. They realistically concluded that their chances of learning enough to pass the test by their own effort were low. As a result of these factors, the GED diploma did not have the same motivating power.

The main ideas that this summary has attempted to present have been eloquently stated by John Holt in a review titled "Children in Prison." The following passage is quoted by permission of the New York Review (copyrighted December 21, 1967).

> ...the teachers...came from predominantly non-intellectual or even anti-intellectual lower-middle-class backgrounds, and they looked on education very much as another branch of the civil service. You didn't go into teaching because you loved learning or believed in its importance, because education meant anything to you or had done

---

[2] In the opinion of some of the personnel from the skill training program, these workbooks were the main reason that the students continued to attend during the summer months of 1966.

anything for you, or because there was anything you particularly wanted to teach, but because the schools were one place that a person without much in the way of ability, training, or connections could get in and, once in, could be sure, if he kept his nose clean and did what he was told, of staying in, until he retired with his pension. In other words, you went into education for the same reason that others went into the police or the Post Office or other parts of the civil service--because it was a safe, secure, and respectable way to move up a rung or two from the bottom of the socio-economic ladder.

Such people, going into teaching for such reasons, are likely, whatever their ethnic or religious backgrounds, to be poor teachers--and poorest of all for the children of our city slums. For one thing, they are generally uneasy about their own status, and consequently prone to overrate the importance of authority and control in the classroom, see challenges to their position and authority where none are meant, and to turn every personal difference or difficulty into such a challenge. For another--Edgar Z. Friedenberg has written ofteh and well about this--they are likely to be bourgeois or commercial in their own values and attitudes, and thus both profoundly hostile to and threatened by the more aristocratic and anarchic values and attitudes of children, above all slum children. For another, they are likely to be neither very interested nor very interesting. They see education only as a way of "getting ahead," and since they have not got very far ahead, they are not very persuasive. To their unspoken or spoken advice, 'Study hard, and you can be like me,' their students answer silently (and not always silently),

> 'You creep, who wants to be like you?' Finally their recent escape from poverty tends to make them particularly contemptuous, fearful, and hostile toward those who are still poor--feelings they are not skillful enough to conceal even if they happen to wish to.

Despite the obvious depth of Holt's feelings he recognizes that the teachers are not solely at fault. The demands of teaching itself, even under favorable conditions; the rigidity and authoritarianism of most schools; the lack of freedom that teachers have experienced throughout their lives; all of these conditions combine to produce frustration and resentment which is directed at their students. And this frustration and resentment will continue as long as schools make demands upon teachers to bring both performance from their students that the students are incapable of producing under the prevailing conditions. In the next section some recommendations are made for changing these conditions.

DEVELOPING PROGRAMS AND TEACHERS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

The theme developed throughout this report is that the traditional, middle-class oriented school cannot adequately serve youngsters from a poverty environment. On the basis of the results of the present study plus familiarity with the relevant literature, ways of changing schools to make them more responsive to the needs and characteristics of disadvantaged young people are discussed. These recommendations are grouped into the following topics: individualization of instruction, flexible grouping and scheduling, and teacher education.

Individualization of Instruction

Much has been written about the individualization of instruction. Unfortunately, the verbalizations have not been reflected in action. Perhaps the concept is too difficult to translate into action but, on occasion, individualized programs have been developed. Perhaps there is a lack of real commitment. In many cases, lip service is given to the ideas. Many educators think individualization is a "good" or "nice" idea, but the changes that would result as individualization became a reality are not acceptable to them. It must be granted that much effort is required to overcome the inertia of habitual behavior.

Of course, individualization of instruction does not mean that each student is to be individually tutored. It does mean that necessary skills will be taught as they are needed and at the level of development of the student. It does mean that a significant portion of the content studied will be largely self-selected by the student. It does mean that the rate of movement through an activity or from activity to activity will be one that is comfortable for the student. Individualization of instruction seeks to protect the identity and integrity of each student by avoiding the compromising experiences of being required to participate in meaningless activities, or of having to keep up with a group that is moving faster than is comfortable, or of being expected to learn highly developed skills when their antecedent, less highly developed skills, have yet to be mastered. Individualization is particularly important for the culturally disadvantaged student. If the principles and technology of individualization were thoroughly implemented from the time the deprived child first entered school, it may be that much of the negativism that these students develop toward school and society could be avoided.

When instruction is individualized, the teacher plays quite a different role from the one he has played in traditional programs. Gone is the concept of the teacher as lecturer, as a talking book. Gone is the concept of the teacher as judge, as disciplinarian. The teacher no longer makes all the plans and all the decisions. To refuse students decision-making power is to tell them not to become involved. Deprivation of decision-making power adds to the very apathy and discontent that education seeks to overcome.

The teacher in an individualized program is primarily responsible for creating an environment full of rich and stimulating opportunities to learn. Such opportunities may include provisions for traveling to visit points of interest, to observe an event or a process, to collect and record information, to come in direct contact with famous or influential individuals or groups, or to use special facilities. Equipment of many types also functions as a part of the environment and might include: typewriters, adding machines, calculators, printing devices of various sorts, tape recorders and phonographs, film strip viewers, various types of projectors, television equipment of all types, sewing, cooking and other homemaking equipment, tools of all kinds, art materials, microscopes, telescopes, and even books.

It must be emphasized that a program cannot be considered individualized unless much of the planning is shared by the teacher and students. Planning will be done with an individual student when only he is involved. Much group planning also will take place. It has been observed that disadvantaged students often know little about planning so that learning to plan may become a very significant activity. Planning not only involves planning activities but also developing codes of behavior and other social, interpersonal, concerns. Throughout his activities, the teacher of an individualized program must be expert at questioning. He must know how to draw out his students thinking and through his questions involve them so deeply in an idea that they, themselves, will begin to ask questions. Until students have formulated questions of great concern to them, they will not have sufficient motive power to work purposefully and independently.

For the culturally disadvantaged student, education must be an awakening. It is not nearly as important what is being studied as it is that the student is willingly and actively involved in studying something. In terms of the student's development, the process of learning about something is more significant than the facts or concepts that he develops. The process once learned can be applied over and over again in the continuous acquisition of knowledge. No legitimate question should be considered unworthy of study. The student's own "whys" are far more important than the stylized "why" of the textbook author. It is not surprising that a discussion of human blood in the integrated science class of the diploma program proved to be the most successful science experience. The students had to prove to themselves that such things as blood types exist. Even the most needle shy student was induced to prick himself for samples so that he could study his own blood. Students were surprised to learn that a Negro and a white person both could have the same blood type. And the Negro students found this more difficult to believe than did the white students.

It is probably obvious at this point that the textbook is among the first victims of the change induced by individualization. Obviously, the mass oriented textbook with its logical presentation of the structure of an academic discipline is as out of place as a buggy on a super highway. Textbooks certainly may be included in the book collection but only when they have value as reference materials. As has already been indicated, all books and the reading activities associated with them should be greatly deemphasized when working with students from poverty backgrounds. This is not to say that reading skills should not be taught; they must be. This is not to say that books should be eliminated; students should have access to the finest, most interesting, and stimulating collection of books that it is possible to assemble. The important difference may be found in the chain of events.

The learning experience does not begin with a book, an unnatural place for the disadvantaged student to begin. The learning experience begins with a question or problem that may develop from experiences gained outside school or may develop from a discussion, demonstration, or other school originated experience. The question or problems may be explored in a number of ways with some form of experimentation at or near the top of the list of preferred types of exploration. Books and reading become part of this process when printed reference materials become the only practical way to answer a question or solve a problem. Indeed, it must be remembered that the nonverbal student, whether deprived or not, probably never will read for pleasure. Certainly, culturally disadvantaged individuals have not had experiences at home to cause them to value books and reading. For the disadvantaged student both natural and environmental factors, therefore, operate to make the suggestion of reading for pleasure a feminine, indeed, oldmaidish cliche.

From this discussion, it should be clear that individualized instruction is not unguided, unplanned, or unstructured. It requires more and harder work on the part of the teacher than does traditional teaching and it presents a greater challenge to the teacher's professional competency. Individualized instruction is certainly not ever meant to represent a chaotic free-for-all. If ways are being sought to create situations where students and teachers can aspire to continuously improving, productive and creative relationships, for the present this way of working may represent the best available solution.

Flexible Grouping and Scheduling

For individualized instruction to operate there must be flexible grouping and scheduling. The teacher must work closely with each student so that he can guide them into the most helpful group situations and assist him in planning the development of his ideas and projects. The teacher will keep careful records so that he can better follow the development of each student, spot areas of difficulty, and act effectively to help his students overcome their problems. As already described, the teacher must be prepared to listen to his students and to spend much time in discussions with both individuals and groups.

Because of the need for interaction with peers as well as with teachers, grouping is vitally important. On the other hand, when groups become too large, interaction may be inhibited or confused. Teachers and students cannot communicate with each other and relationships are stunted. Certainly, when students and teachers are from different social backgrounds, when students so desperately feel the need to have their individual identities recognized, when students feel negatively towards learning, school and teachers, it is extremely important that the number of pupils assigned to teachers be kept small enough so that sensitive and effective communication can take place. The argument that hiring extra teachers for the disadvantaged is too costly ignores consideration of what the costs may be if such teachers are not hired. Such bankrupt verbalizations and the do-nothing behavior that accompanies them are evidence of a total unawareness of the interrelationships between social phenomena and are professionally irresponsible.

Class size, of course, is not the only serious organizational problem encountered when developing programs for the disadvantaged. Inflexible grouping and rigid time schedules also represent artificial barriers to the development of relationships and may seriously interfere with communication. Rare is the secondary teacher who has not had a vital class discussion cut short by the ringing of a bell announcing the end of the period. The decision to ring the bell at that moment was made perhaps years before and with no possible knowledge of the conditions that would exist in that particular classroom on that particular day. This "logical" system of ordering time is a fine example of the middle class oriented need to organize life into a neat and orderly outline not drawn from the rhythm and flow of life itself but imposed upon it.

The culturally deprived student with his rejection of formality, his needs for peer interaction and acceptance, perhaps his limited or underdeveloped interest patterns, his lack of self-confidence, and his lost curiosity is in particular need of opportunities to group and regroup as the situation requires. He may react quite negatively to some teacher or some groups of his peers and must have a way to move out of these situations. He may need to spend most of his time with one particular person with whom he can identify and to whom he can relate. He may need to spend time along or with a friend or two working with a particular piece of equipment, discussing an urgent or fascinating problem. Flexibility in grouping and in the use of time can permit opportunities for the culturally disadvantaged student to explore, to regain his lost curiosity, to overcome his apathy.

For many reasons, teachers also need flexibility of time and grouping. Probably the most significant reason is the need to be able to assign students to instructional experiences on the basis of actual student need for the experience and at the time that students are ready for such experiences. With a flexible organization of time, teachers can arrange to spend time with individual students. One of the most significant functions of the teacher may be to listen. Once the teacher has won the confidence of the culturally disadvantaged student, the teacher must be prepared to listen. Lack of a sympathetic and understanding listener is one of the most unfortunate deprivations of the disadvantaged student. He needs to talk, to verablize his feelings. It is through talk that language and ideas are developed and tested. It is from the reactions of those who hear us that we learn of our worth.

Flexibility of time and grouping also permit teachers freedom of movement. When the teacher is not always tied to a particular spot, he is freed to work with other teachers. Instructional planning and activities can be shared. The problems of individual students can be discussed. Ideas can be exchanged. Teachers who work in this way become more involved with their students. Sharing goals and working together towards them can make teaching much more exciting.

Because of the need imposed by the nature of the primary research to develop a diploma program not radically different from high school general education programs now in existence, the diploma program followed a rather traditional high school curriculum. In the same sense, the skill training program may be considered typical of its type. While some may argue that success of the diploma program negates any need for further curriculum development, it must be noted that many students left this program as well as the skill training program. For them, these programs did not have sufficient value to outweigh the forces pulling them away. It certainly may be inferred that while research requirements dictated high school general education and skill training programs that were recognizably similar to those currently in existence, neither type of curriculum should be considered the ultimate in the arrangement of instructional experiences for disadvantaged students.

Teacher Education

It is to be hoped and could be assured through selection procedures that future teachers of the disadvantaged are humanistically oriented and have the capacity to empathize with others. It also would seem wise to make every effort to attract very able people to this difficult teaching assignment. The available evidence suggests that the more intelligent teacher is more likely to possess superior creative ability and, therefore, may be less conforming in his behavior. Because of this, he may be more likely to respond to different value systems and to be perceptive enough to detect the flaws in his inherited value system. It may be that students who demonstrate the capacity for active but constructive rebellion will prove the most satisfactory teachers of the disadvantaged. It is interesting to note that the teachers in the diploma program who appeared to be the most successful were, in their private lives, actively rebelling against one or more social forces in their own environments. Some had developed very negative feelings towards the prevailing educational establishment and this served as the bond of identification between them and their culturally deprived students. Both rejected school as they knew it before they joined the diploma program.

Given future teachers or teachers in-service who may come from upwardly mobile backgrounds but who also possess most of the desired traits or characteristics, it would seem that two areas of professional education are the most pertinent to preparation to teach the disadvantaged: First, knowledge of human development and behavior to help break down culturally inherited stereotypes and to provide a basis for understanding and identifying with students; and, second, technological skills to create vital learning experiences. There is nothing new in these recommendations. Change will take place when the ways of attempting to provide these professional understandings and skills are reoriented away from middle class patterns and standards.

Much has been said about the values of practicum for future teachers. Student teaching is a well established fact in teacher education and other types of practicum are advocated. The critical issue is, again, that these experiences become ends in themselves. Desirable value changes do not take place regardless of the experiences that the individual has; they take place because of them. Only certain kinds of experiences can produce changes that will cause the teachers to be more accepting of the problems and behavior of the groups most limited socioeconomically. These experiences must be of the kind that will bring teachers and students together under circumstances where they must react to each other as individuals. For some teachers, the practicum experience might be to work with a very gifted teacher in a slum school; for another, it might be working in the children's ward of a city hospital. For another, it might be tutoring children of migrant workers or working in a day care center. Again, there are many possibilities. The fact is that teachers must have experience to provide a background powerful enough to generate questions worth studying. The quantity and type of experience should be decided on an individual basis through joint consultation between the future teacher and his teacher. Again, it may be argued that this could become a very expensive process. To fail to invest what is necessary to provide appropriate professional training for teachers, however, may lead to far greater expense as the problems of poverty become more severe and disruptive to our nation.

It certainly may be agreed that the education of teachers of the disadvantaged should include pertinent concepts from the social disciplines of psychology, anthropology, sociology, and economics. It does not follow, however, that teachers should automatically be required to take formal courses in these disciplines. Concepts should be developed as part of the process of seeking solutions to the student teacher's own questions and concerns or in the development of his plans and projects.

Too long have students of education gained the impression that few of their professors are willing to practice what they preach. It would seem logical to begin the education of teachers by placing them in a learning situation that is representative of the type of situation they are to establish in their own schools. If teachers of the disadvantaged are to individualize instruction for their students, then instruction for teachers should also be individualized.

The value, or lack of value, of technical training for teachers has been the topic of much public debate. The fact remains that no profession functions without specific technical training. In a sense, the experiences already described are a part of the technical training for a career in education. But more refined and specialized training also is required. It may be granted that many of the skills of the superior teacher are developed on the job. It is extremely important, however, that the teacher new to the teaching of the disadvantaged possess the skills necessary to be able to experience at least limited success in his initial attempts. Without this success, the opportunity is created for the development of hostility toward students.

The concept of methodology, however, is archaic. Training teachers to teach reading or arithmetic or handwriting or grammar is as outdated and as superficial as the subjects themselves. The emphasis should be on the teaching skills, regardless of the subject. A compilation of these skills probably would include skills such as: the ability to question effectively, the ability to lead group discussions, organizational skills, etc. It is not necessary to identify the teaching skills that must be mastered but only to indicate the need to clarify these skills and to design around them the professional training of future and in-service teachers. Obviously, even students preparing to be teachers should not be required to study skills that they already have mastered.

Teachers who possess the basic personality characteristics that predispose them to sympathetic and humanitarian attitudes toward others, who have gained insights into the handicap of poverty, who have found a way to identify with the culturally disadvantaged, who have mastered essential teaching skills, and who also have creative leadership, flexible school organization, and an individualized curriculum, should be able to develop positive relationships with culturally disadvantaged students and through these relationships, contribute their share towards the relief of some of the problems of poverty.

REFERENCES

Allen, C.M. *Combating the dropout problem*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1956.

Andrews, M.E. Reclaiming the dropouts. *Minnesota Journal of Education*, 1951, *31*, 27.

Arbuckle, D.S. Counseling and dropouts: General considerations. In D. Schreiber (Ed.) *Guidance and the high school dropout*. Washington: National Education Association, 1964. Pp. 176-192.

Arnholter, E.G. School persistence and personality factors. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1956, *35*, 107-109.

Ausubel, D.P. Effects of cultural deprivation on learning patterns. In S.W. Webster (Ed.) *The disadvantaged learner*. San Francisco: Chandler, 1966.

Ausubel, D.P., & Ausubel, P. Ego development among segregated Negro children. In A.H. Passow (Ed.) *Education in depressed areas*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962. Pp. 109-141.

Barcus, N. *The Detroit High School Leaver Project*. Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, October, 1964.

Bertrand, A. L. School attendance and attainment: Function and dysfunction of school and family social systems. *Social Forces*, 1962, *40*, 228-233.

Blackwell, G. W., & Godwin, W.L. Social class and economic problems of adolescents. *High School Journal*, 1952, *35*, 166-169.

Bloom, B.S., Davis, A., & Hess, R. *Compensatory education for cultural deprivation.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1965.

Blough, T.B. *A critical analysis of selected research literature on the problem of school dropouts.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1956. No. 19,613.

Brav, S.C. *Jewish family solidarity: Myth or fact?* Vicksburg, Tennessee: Author, 1940.

Burchill, G. W., Jr. *Educational needs of adult high school students as determined by tests of achievement.* (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1959. No. 59-6764.

Cantoni, L.J. Stay-ins get better jobs. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1955, *33*, 531.

Cervantes, L.F. *The dropout: Causes and cures.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

Chansky, N.M. *Untapped good: The rehabilitation of school dropouts.* Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1966.

Clarke, A.D.B., & Clarke, A.M. How constant is the IQ? *Lancet*, 1953, *2*, 877-880.

Cloward, R.A., & Ohlin, L.E. *Delinquency and opportunity.* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960.

Cohen, A.H. *Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang.* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.

Coleman, J.S. The adolescent subculture and academic achievement. *American Sociological Review*, 1960, *55*, 337.

Coleman, J.S. *The adolescent society: The social life of the teenager and its impact on education.* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1961.

Conant, J.B. *Slums and suburbs.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Curry, R.L. The effect of socio-economic status on the scholastic achievement of sixth grade children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1962, *32*, 46-49.

Dave, R.H. The identification and measurement of environmental process variables that are related to educational achievement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963.

Davis, A. *Social-class influences upon learning*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Della-Dora, D. The culturally disadvantaged: Educational implications of certain socio-cultural phenomena. *Exceptional Children*, 1962, *28*, 467-472.

Dentler, R.A. Dropouts, automation, and the cities. *Teachers College Record*, 1964, *65*, 475-483.

Deutsch, M. *Minority group and class status as related to social and personality factors in scholastic achievement*. Monograph No. 2, Society for Applied Anthropology, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1960.

Deutsch, M. *The role of social class in language development and cognition*. New York: Institute for Developmental Studies, 1964. (a)

Deutsch, M. Early social environment: Its influence on school adaptation. In D. Schreiber (Ed.) *The school dropout*. Washington: National Education Association, 1964. Pp. 89-100. (b)

Deutsch, M., & Brown, B. Social influences in Negro-white intelligence differences. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1964, *20*, 24-35.

Dillon, H.J. *Early school leavers*. New York: National Child Labor Committee, 1949.

Douvan, E. Social status and success strivings. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1956, *52*, 219-223.